DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 445 AC 001 639

By-Goldman, Freda, H., Ed.
Reorientation in Labor Education; A Symposium on Liberal Education for Labor in the University. CSLEA Reports.
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.
Pub Date 62
Note-116p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.90
Descriptors-Curriculum, Educational Objectives, *Experimental Programs, *General Education, Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Labor Education, *Labor Unions, Leadership Training, Participation, Residential Programs, *University Extension
Identifiers-Canada

The existence and achievements of experimental, university-connected programs of liberal study for labor are discussed. First to be considered are the underlying problems and aims of both labor education and university liberal education. Next, specific programs are described: the Liberal Arts for Labor program offered through the Extension Division of UCLA; the United Steelworkers of America fourth year institute ("The World of Ideas"); the Institute Labor Program at Rutgers; the National Institute for Labor Education resident study program for union staff; and the two year Union Leadership Program at the University of Chicago for Chicago area trade union leaders. Patterns of nonuniversity-connected liberal education for trade unionists, and of liberal education in Canadian labor education, are also reviewed. Finally, common problems of winning support, providing for university union cooperation, and adapting programs to a union audience are summarized, together with suggested directions and approaches for seeking solutions. (ly)

ED027445

2459

67

CSLEA REPORTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REORIENTATION IN LABOR EDUCATION

A Symposium on Liberal Education for Labor in the University

Edited by FREDA H. GOLDMAN

CENTER for the STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

AC001639

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, *Clark University*
JAMES T. CAREY, *University of California*
JOHN P. DYER, *Tulane University*
CYRIL O. HOULE, *University of Chicago*
H. LICHTENSTEIN, *Hofstra College*
JACK LONDON, *University of California*
ERNEST E. MCMAHON, *Rutgers University*
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, *New York University*
ALAN M. THOMAS, *Canadian Association for Adult Education*
CLIFFORD L. WINTERS, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and philosophy, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, monographs, and journal reprints.

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
4819 S. Greenwood Ave.
Chicago 15, Illinois

REORIENTATION IN LABOR EDUCATION

A Symposium on Liberal Education for Labor in the University

Edited by FREDA H. GOLDMAN

Staff Assistant
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**

THE CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established in 1951 by a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with universities seeking to initiate or improve programs of liberal education for adults. The purpose of the Center is "to help American higher education develop greater effectiveness and a deeper sense of responsibility for the liberal education of adults." Communications may be addressed to the Director, 4819 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

Copyright 1962 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

PERSPECTIVES 5

The Unions and Liberal Education for Labor . . . . Lawrence Rogin 5

Labor Education and the Universities . . . . Jack London 11

UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS 25

Liberal Arts for Labor, The University of California . . . . Anne L. Gould 25

World of Ideas: Fourth Year Institute, United Steelworkers of America . . . . . Emery F. Bacon 43

Institute Labor Program, Rutgers University . . . . Irvine L. H. Kerrison 51

Resident Study Programs for Union Staff, National Institute for Labor Education . . . . Russell Allen 61

Union Leadership Program, University of Chicago . . . . John McCollum 75

PROGRAMS IN OTHER CONTEXTS 89

Survey of Non-University Connected Liberal Education for Trade Unionists . . . . Hy Kornbluh 89

Liberal Education in Canadian Labour Education . . . . Max Swerdlow 101

REVIEW 111

A Summary of Problems and Directions . . . . A. A. Liveright 111

INTRODUCTION

Although labor education of any kind, and particularly liberal education, is still not in any sense an important part of most universities' agendas, the existence—and achievements—of the university-connected programs of liberal study for labor discussed in this document form a significant aspect of university adult liberal education. These programs, all consciously experimental, are outstanding large-scale efforts to bring the resources of higher education to the service of the labor movement, as other programs have brought them to the farmer, the professional, the executive. This publication is intended to provide an account of these experiments in liberal education, as viewed by persons closely connected with their development, in sufficient breadth to be useful, not only to those involved in labor education, but to all engaged in the liberal education of adults.

Programs of liberal education for labor have come into being, and continue to grow, largely as an effect of the recognition that the more direct and more influential role today played by unions within the society as a whole requires a leadership broadly educated. Heavier duties and responsibilities now fall on union officers of all levels. Not only has the conduct of the union's internal affairs become more complicated, but the union, as a major force in the society, is confronted also with the complex problems that today beset the society as a whole. A number—admittedly not large—of labor educators have become convinced that workers need education which goes beyond the narrow utilitarian ends of the traditional bargaining and management courses that still comprise the bulk of labor education in this country. The regnant defense of such educational expansion remains essentially utilitarian, at least on the rhetorical level; but it is utilitarianism of a more intangible, more ultimate, less immediately observable kind. The union man, it is argued, can serve his union—and his country—best if he is educated to see union problems from a widened perspective, to take into account less immediate ends than have heretofore almost exclusively concerned him; he has to understand the larger social picture, to view the union's self-interest in the light of the needs of the society as a whole. A wise leadership, liberally educated along these lines (the appropriate curriculum usually stresses the social sciences) is essential to deal with the union's new and expanded responsibilities, important not only for the general welfare, but, and even more directly, to the life of the union itself. Thus, statements of objectives are in a large measure characterized by goals of service to the union and the society.

There is another theme, however, that also runs through rationales for liberal labor education: the preparation of working men for the use of leisure. It is obvious that leisure is emerging as an ever larger and more demanding part of the worker's life—a leisure in which there is not only free time, but vigor and means for experimentation with leisure's many different uses. Thus, although only secondarily, the development of the individual worker in his personal growth is frequently included in statements of objectives and rationales for worker's education. Educators imply that a fully conceived program of liberal education for the worker today, as for everyone else, has to include education not designed for any extrinsic end, but to bring about results "somehow terminating in and intrinsic to the one being educated"—the development of the individual for complete living, for the "simple gratification of the tastes and the feelings" and for the "life of the mind." But this kind of emphasis in labor education is still more of a promise than a reality in most curricula. Today the motive force, if the individual is the object of consideration, is to help the union man find personal fulfillment in social service. A motive difficult to quarrel with—and not so very different from the characteristic mode of liberal education as offered to other groups in the society.

This kind of reasoning—variously modified and elaborated—underlies the rationale behind most of the university-connected programs described in this symposium. The growing recognition—for whatever reasons—of the need to find ways to broaden the education of union leaders and members was responsible for bringing them into existence, and they continue as experiments in liberal education. Thus the programs described are still very much in the process of evolution; revisions, reconstructions, re-evaluation are the order of the day.

In addition to the core articles describing the individual programs, we have included, in order to place these programs in perspective, four supportive papers. The symposium opens with two overview articles, one written by a leading labor educator, Lawrence Rogin of the AFL-CIO, and the other by a university professor, Jack London of the University of California. Although the two writers approach their subject very differently, each gives us a challenging statement of what the situation looks like from his vantage point. The symposium concludes (prior to the summation) with two background articles—a perceptive analysis of liberal labor education outside the universities by Hy Kornbluh of the University of Michigan, Wayne State Labor Education and Services Division, and a view of Canadian labor education by Max Swerdlow of the Canadian Labour Congress.

The experience and thought revealed in these articles says much, as we have already indicated, about all liberal education for adults. A great many of the problems—concerning content, method, format, materials—are similar to those encountered in programming for any group of adults. Clearly, however, liberal education for labor has its special concerns, and to focus attention on some of these, the writers were asked, in addition to describing their programs, to comment specifically on the following three central aspects of liberal labor education, indicating how what is actually being done bears on these matters, and how ideally they ought to be dealt with.

1. The underlying concept of the role of liberal study in labor education.

   What is meant by "liberal education for labor?" What image of the liberally educated union man is envisioned? What values are aimed at—by the university, by the union, by the individual participant?

2. Principles and conditions of cooperation between union and university.

   A special factor in liberal labor education is that it requires rapproachement between two agencies (union and university) that have not had much experience in working together. Unions are not always sure they want the university to get into this work, and the union man, as an educational target, is relatively unknown to the university educator. What instrumentalities, what adaptation of attitudes, what conditions are needed for effective cooperative operation?

3. Kinds of adaptation of the traditional curriculum and patterns of instruction that are necessary to meet liberal educational needs and potential of the labor man.

   In most cases, the university educator cannot rely on past formal education as a basis for his program. How can liberal education be offered in a way that will be relevant to union men who may have had little previous higher education?

Most of the writers, as you will note, have dealt consciously and conscientiously with these questions, and the fact that their comments contain much that is illuminating, is underlined by Dr. Liveright's interpretive summary, the concluding article in the series. It is particularly interesting to note that some of the same points turn up in nearly every paper, often even in the same words, a persistent indication that there are some very stubborn problems here. But although the obstacles are real, the efforts to overcome are often highly successful. The ingenuity, flexibility, inventiveness, and tenacity of those who work in this area are impressive. Their sense of purpose is patent, and their commitment —often zeal—is clearly deep.

It will be clear to the reader that the articles in this symposium—strictly limited as they were with respect to length, and focus—were not intended by their authors or the editors to present fully comprehensive accounts of their subjects. Editorial requirements forced writers to restrict themselves to the high lights as they saw them. We wish to express our appreciation to the authors who accepted, without complaining, these conditions, and who, in spite of them, have provided us with a picture, vivid and true, of the state of university liberal labor education in the country today.

To the staff of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, the planning and production of this publication was a pleasing labor. As is well-known, CSLEA has long been a proponent of university programs of liberal education for labor, and, in a variety of ways, it has been closely connected with almost every one of the programs described in this document. With the United Steel Workers and Pennsylvania State University, it participated in setting up the first of the Steelworker's Fourth Year Institute; to UCLA and Rutgers, it provided seed grants and other support to help launch experimental ventures on their campuses; one staff man, for a number of years, worked in the labor education program at the University of Chicago. This publication, therefore, grew out of a close and continuing interest in what was being done in this area of liberal education. The time seems right for some taking of stock. In the belief that this recapitulation of some of the most significant activities and their implications is both timely and useful this publication is offered to the field.

F. H. G.

Lawrence Rogin

THE UNIONS AND LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR LABOR

The university programs for labor described in this publication, says Rogin, are "not so very different from the labor education offered thirty-five years ago," but they are a "departure from most labor education today." Taking this long view, he notes their distinguishing features, and finds the problems they raise essentially similar to those that trouble all forms of labor education. In the course of his perspicuous analysis, Rogin identifies and probes gently the major issues with which the papers that follow are concerned.

Lawrence Rogin is Director of the Department of Education of the AFL-CIO. In the course of about twenty years of experience in labor education, he has held such positions as Director of the Division of Labor Education and Services of the University of Michigan-Wayne State University, and Director of Education for the Textile Workers of America.

Almost by definition all education is "liberal," or perhaps "liberating" is a better word. For it is in the concern for the growth of the individual that education differs from training and indoctrination.

For this reason, the most practical union courses, well taught, serve some of the goals of liberal education as defined by authors in this symposium.

The UCLA program, Anne Gould writes, was "to help the union officer and union member to gain understanding of himself, his fellow man, his society and the role the labor movement can play."

The Fourth Year Steelworkers program was intended "1) to stimulate participants to think critically about themselves as individuals and members of an industrial society, 2) to open possible areas of creativity, and 3) to develop an understanding of the values by which men live."

And Kerrison writes of a thirst "for education which permits one to take stock of his way of life and encourages . . . self-mastery of the whole man."

There is nothing which automatically forecloses these goals from being achieved in a curriculum which concentrates on collective bargaining, union administration, labor history, full employment and legislative issues; almost a standard pattern for a standard union institute, or for a series of evening classes.

Issues of morals and ethics arise throughout such a course of study, and some understanding of society is essential for the classes to be successful in the most practical sense.

Yet the programs that are described are a departure from most labor education today. They are not so different from the labor education of 35 years ago. Certainly the emphasis was on the broad social sciences at Brookwood, the Bryn Mawr and other summer schools for women workers, the Rand School, the early programs of the International Ladies Garment Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the city "labor colleges" of the early 1920's, and the University of Wisconsin's School for Workers.

In these programs, too, the social sciences were supplemented by the humanities. There was philosophy and literature and drama. Night courses ran the traditional semester, and the summer resident programs were six or eight weeks, with university faculty making up a large part of the teaching staff.

But this past is long gone, and almost forgotten. The programs described in this booklet are different from the bulk of today's labor education.

(It should be pointed out that there are programs not mentioned here which might also fit. For example, Ohio State's Cincinnati seminars attract staff and local leadership for integrated and long-term study. The Harvard resident course, essentially "practical" in format, includes a concentration on the social sciences and requires a great deal from the students. Advanced one-week institutes conducted by many unions concentrate on the subject matter of the social sciences.)

In part this difference is described in terms of broad rather than "practical" goals, although some of the authors argue vehemently that the broad approach is the only practical one for today's labor movement.

What else then distinguishes these programs?

Is it partly that the approach is from general principles and a general understanding, rather than from the particular to the general?

Is it partly that the approach is from the traditional academic discipline rather than the immediate union problem?

Is it partly that the courses are taught by university instructors whose first concern is understanding of a total concept rather than solution of an immediate problem?

Is it partly that the education is aimed at the individual student rather than the union institution, so that individual growth is the greatest concern?

Is it partly that more is expected from the student, both in and out of class; more work, and more willingness to challenge his own preconceptions?

Is it partly that the nature of the program and the recruitment processes limit the programs to the more mature and those with some intellectual curiosity?

In the case of most of the programs, but certainly not the Steelworkers, the time allotted for study permits greater depth.

There is an element of some of these in all of the programs, and all of them in some, even though they differ so much in so many ways.

One danger for adult educators, whether in the universities or in the unions, would be to regard these programs as alternatives to other educational activities. Even putting the case in the terms of the liberal educators, the complications of today's union life require training as well as understanding, and properly conducted "tool" courses are probably a better way of arousing a concern for broad education than indiscriminate recruiting without regard to the previous experience and present responsibilities of the unionists being attracted. Early labor educators were aware of the "perpetual student" whose goal in life seemed to be to continue his education rather than to contribute to his union, or to society from his own experience and learning. Education, no doubt, should serve this interest. But serving it should not be a major purpose of liberal education programs for unionists.

I should like to make one more comment before going on to the questions raised by the editors of this publication. The UCLA experiment was tried, we are told, in part because of the failure of the university to attract workers, whether trade unionists or not, to a very successful series of liberal arts discussion groups. This experience was not unique. In general, American adult education has failed to attract workers to its broad community oriented programs. For years, labor educators have been telling the general adult educators that special approaches are necessary if adult education is to reach beyond those already broadly educated, and that this is true in almost every aspect of adult education. This publication demonstrates the wisdom of the labor educators' approach. Workers can be attracted to the broadest of educational programs, if this special effort is made. The next step, of course, is to integrate into the general programs those who have passed through this special experience.

For a trade union educator perhaps the most interesting conclusion from these experiences is the applicability to this field of the lessons we have learned about the general problems of cooperation between universities and unions in what the promoters of these programs might call the more pedestrian aspects of labor education.

There needs to be cooperation between the university and the union in planning and recruiting, and a strong union committee is the best way to accomplish this. It is possible that not all the writers would agree with me that it should be the same committee that cooperates with the university in all aspects of its work with unions, and that the university administration should be in the same hands. This would avoid the possibility of competing programs. It would help to relate all programs for unions to one another. It would make it possible for the programs conducted directly by the unions and those conducted in cooperation with the university to complement one another, and to influence each other.

The average university professors cannot take their courses, their reading lists, and their teaching habits directly from the college to the class made up of workers. This is put perhaps most strongly by A. O. Lewis, of Pennsylvania State University, who has headed the program which has concentrated the most on the humanities. Emery Bacon quotes him as writing that "literature has been used—to the dismay of my more conservative colleagues—almost as a social science, a means of illustrating something about our way of life." And again, "We have not used ordinary teaching methods: all members are present in class together, and teaching as a team, they complement and support each other. . . ."

In a different way the same point is made by all of the authors. The backgrounds, the interests of the students must dominate the educational method if the experience is to be successful. This seems to be the case whether the worker student is self-selected, as at Chicago, and to some extent at UCLA, or whether he has been assigned by his union to study, as was the case with the bulk of those in the NILE resident training programs.

What is most clear, of course, is that the student must be actively involved in the learning process. He won't learn just by listening and reading. The answer to this problem may have been quite different in each program, and perhaps even with each teacher or subject, but the principle is general. The course must be made meaningful in the experience of the student, whether the subject matter is the social sciences or the humanities. The courses in the humanities seem farthest removed from the experiences of workers, yet Max Goldberg regarded the Steelworkers program successful because, "by the end of the week he (the student) thought he had learned many things that were good to know both as an individual and as a union officer." For most unionists, the motivation to learning still comes from their role in society. This appears to be true when the course starts "far out" and permits the relevance to arise during the teaching, or when the course starts with some immediate union problem and turns the attention of the student to the values of broad understanding.

We still don't know enough about the kinds of students who have participated in all these programs to make firm judgments about the differences in approaches that must be made to students from the various levels of union responsibility; to those with varying educational backgrounds; to those who are self-selected students, in contrast with those who are assigned. Nor do we know much yet about the application of the learning to the lives, private and union, of those who have participated. But this is not unusual about educational experience generally. Both UCLA and Chicago report an increased desire for more formal education by some students. This is all to the good, and not unexpected. I suspect the same result among those who have participated in the more traditional union educational programs.

There is one administrative question which seems to me of great importance in the continuing development of all kinds of broad and intensive training of trade unionists by universities. We have seen that success is dependent on special attention to the problem, special approaches in recruiting, and special techniques in teaching. All education is expensive, and education to meet special needs is even more expensive. Are the universities prepared to contribute a sizeable proportion of the costs?

Aside from agriculture, extension education is oftimes a university stepchild. In most universities the extension classes, unlike the resident instruction, must meet all instructional costs, and in some cases, pay a proportion of overhead as well. I would suggest that the universities must change this policy radically if they are really concerned with liberal education for workers. Many, but not all, universities have seen this with regard to their labor education programs.

The UCLA, Chicago, and NILE programs were made possible by sizeable foundation grants. The university financial contributions were large in the NILE institutes, and may have been in the others. This information is not available to me at this time.

Will the programs continue when the grants are exhausted? Will other universities start classes without foundation help? How expensive will the classes be? These are questions which remain unanswered. I would argue that the foundations have a responsibility for further experimentation, but that universities must see a financial as well as an educational responsibility for a continuing program.

What of the union responsibility? We will continue to pay our share of the cost, as we have in university labor education in the past. We will continue to support more intensive study, as unions are now doing. We will try to help make the education most meaningful to the participants and to the unions from which they come. And I hope we will continue to provide a total program of education of which this broader experience can be a part.

Jack London

LABOR EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITIES

London sees many very serious obstacles to the proper development of liberal labor education in the universities. He dissects, with minute care, in turn, such factors as the tendency to define rigidly what compromises liberal education; the existence of a philosophy of "elitism" in educational circles; the peripheral position of all adult education in the colleges; the lack of concern for good teaching among university faculties; the "fear" of formal education among working men, and many others.

To overcome these obstacles, London says, the unions will have to learn how to exert pressure on institutions of higher learning, and to insist on the kind of educational services they need and deserve.

Jack London is Associate Professor of Adult Education at the University of California at Berkeley. His knowledge and concern in the special area of labor education stems from his experience as President of UAW-Local 6, and his work in the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago.

An Approach to a Definition of Liberal Education for the Labor Movement

There are many different definitions of liberal education, and a great variety of models of the liberally educated man.[1] But whether we start with one definition or another, the essential quality of all definitions seems to be a concern with what it takes to produce an individual who is continually at work at his own development. In other words, the essence of a liberally educated man is that he is active in pursuing a more or less systematic program of learning which is never completed.[2] The liberally educated individual is one who has developed the ability to learn how to learn.[3]

---

[1] Frederick Mayer, Philosophy of Education for Our Time (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1958); Jacques Barzun, The House of Intellect (New York: Harper, 1959); G. B. Harrison, Profession of English (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962); A. Whitney Griswold, Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959); and Howard Mumford Jones, Reflections on Learning (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1958).

A common component, however, of many current views of liberal education is their prescription that the way to liberal education lies only along one clearly defined pathway—the disciplines of the so-called liberal arts. Thus, many programs, characterized as liberalizing, prescribe educational activity of a ritualistic kind. This is true even though we have learned from our educational experiences that there is no single road to learning, and that in spite of the claims made for one discipline or another, an approach to liberal education ought to provide for a variety of methods and subjects.

Many thoughtful writers have expressed strong opinions on this subject. Robert Redfield, for example, urged: "No particular program is right for everyone. Distrust the claim that someone has found the ultimate curriculum, the right way to learn for all men."[4] John Dewey said that what is liberal in education is not determined by the particular subject, but by the way in which the subject is treated.[5] A. N. Whitehead also rejected a prevailing traditional view of liberal education when he declared that, "The antithesis between a technical education and a liberal education is fallacious. There can be no adequate technical education which is not liberal and no liberal education which is not technical."[6]

Our own approach to liberal education, as we relate it to the labor movement, is that its objective should be to provide liberalizing educational *experience*, to help the worker-student to learn how to learn, how

---

2. Robert Redfield, *The Educational Experience* (Pasadena: Fund for Adult Education, 1955), p. 41.

3. Irving Lorge, "Exploring Man's Intelligence," *An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World*, ed. Lyman Bryson (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 131.

4. Redfield, p. 9 [refers again to Redfield's book, cited in full form in n. 2].

5. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916).

6. A. N. Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*, Mentor edition, p. 58.

to think clearly, to free his mind from narrow prejudice, or indifference; or to state it positively, to open up new areas of interest and concern, buttressing these with the knowledge and understanding that will enable him to become more than he is, and, thereby, to develop within himself the need and desire to engage in a continuous and systematic program of life-long learning.

Many advocates of "liberal education" have a rigid image of the kind of person who is qualified for such study. They see an "elite" type of individual with a prescribed level of formal schooling as the only kind of person who can profit. A widespread view is that we can readily separate people into "natural" categories of the bright and the dull, the "bright" being the only ones able to engage in higher education. A graphic statement of this was made by the State Employment Director of California, when he said that, "Each kid (or adult) must be given a series of tests—either he has it or he doesn't."[7] While we accept the view that education makes a difference, the prevailing attitude persists, that human beings can be ordered into a hierarchy of ability, and only at the top of the hierarchy are those with the capacity to profit from higher learning. Faced with the need to educate workers, there is a tendency to look askance at those students who come with few of the formal credentials that generally determine eligibility for university work, nor, generally, with the normally accepted signs of "brightness." (In addition, as still another problem when labor education is contemplated, there is the traditional bias against adults seeking education, as if the young were the only ones able to profit from formal schooling. This view is too well known to us to require elaboration here.)

If the labor movement is to be involved in programs of liberal education, such points of view must be rejected in favor of a philosophy of education, which bases itself on the assumption that workers, without the usual academic qualifications, can come to grips with great ideas and systems of thought. There is, of course, considerable evidence that they can—if they are helped to learn how to learn, if they are involved in educational programs which make ideas come alive, where subject matter is presented by teachers who can convey to students their own enthusiasm for learning, and their confidence in the student's potential to share

---

7. San Francisco Chronicle, September 22, 1961, p. 4.

this enthusiasm and to learn. The key seems to be the establishment of a climate that generates the expectation that the worker-students can learn, that they can develop the motivation to expend effort, and to make the commitment of time necessary for intellectual growth.[8]

The question before us, then, is whether the university as it now exists and operates can provide this kind of experience to people in the labor movement. Several aspects of the university need to be examined if we are to know the answers.

Looking at the University

> The objectives of the University of California are teaching and research. In addition, public service springs from these activities. The unique characteristic of a great university is that these functions interact on each other to produce an effect that is more creative and important than if the three were isolated.[9]

The university has traditionally been viewed as a community of scholars, engaged in the pursuit of truth, and the dissemination of knowledge to its students. Briefly looking back in history, an early function of our universities was to provide a teaching and learning environment for young people interested largely in training for the ministry, law, and medicine. Initially, the curriculum tended to concentrate almost entirely on the liberal arts, but additional faculties were later added as the university took on the training of students for other professions as well.

With the growth of technology and science, the university began to include a concern for research as one of its basic functions. In addition, as industrialization advanced and spurred the development of new knowledge, specialization became inevitable, and in the university where, until the beginning of this century, most professors taught in many areas of the curriculum, teachers too became specialists. Thus, research, as well as teaching, has become an integral part of the objectives of the university, within a framework of growing specialization among and within academic disciplines.

---

[8] There is evidence that the abilities of people are not set by genetic factors but arise out of the sociological conditions prevalent in their society. ". . . to an important degree, a society generates its level of ability, and further that the upper limit is unknown and distant, and best of all, that the generation of ability are potentially subject to intentional control."

Robert E. L. Faris, "Reflections on the Ability Dimension in Human Society," American Sociological Review (December, 1961), p. 837.

[9] University of California Fifteen All-University Faculty Conference, Proceedings, The Research Function of the University (1960), p. 7.

The third function, that of public service, emerged for American universities at about the beginning of the twentieth century. This function, also possibly related to the growth of concern for technology and science, was spurred by the experience of such an institution as The Chautauqua Movement, and a "model of a university" created by the formation of The University of Chicago in 1892.[10] By and large, the function of service has usually been seen as an extension of the functions of teaching and research, as is indicated in the University of California statement cited at the head of this section. Burch spells out two current views of the service function in the university. On the one hand, there is the belief that the university has a responsibility to share its knowledge with all interested individuals in the community, and on the other, is the view that the university should seek out the intellectual needs and interests of people and find ways of satisfying these needs and interests.[11]

While most students of higher education accept this threefold responsibility of the university—teaching, research, and public service—the service function remains a peripheral concern of the faculty and of most administrators. Only where faculties are able to secure ample stipends for service as consultants to industry, business, agriculture, or government does this function take on a more respectable image. A scholar in the field of labor education put the matter this way:

> . . . unions have been and still are suspicious of the efforts of the universities to invade the field of industrial relations and workers' education. They contend that most university governing boards and far too many administrative officers and faculty members have management orientation; that they have little or no understanding of the problems and aspirations of the worker; that universities have for the most part emphasized those areas that serve either industry, the professions, or the farmer; and that, hence, they have no real understanding of the needs of the people who labor with their hands in the industrial arena.[12]

---

[10] Joseph E. Gould, The Chautauqua Movement: An Episode in the Continuing American Revolution (New York: University Publishers, Inc., 1961), pp. 51-71.

[11] Glen Burch, Challenge to the University: An Inquiry into the University's Responsibility for Adult Education. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults #35 (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961), p. 19.

[12] Vidkunn Ulriksson, "The Scope, Function, and Limitations of

It is our belief that, except for a very few institutions, these charges against the university are more real than imaginary. Thus, labor education within the university has two serious handicaps to overcome—the marginal role of the service function in general within the university (within which adult education usually falls), and an equally important obstacle, a prevailing indifferent, and sometimes even antagonistic, attitude on the part of both university and labor toward the notion that the labor movement needs educational services from the university. The indifference on the part of the university can in part be accounted for by the view already discussed that workers cannot profit from university training, and that, therefore, any university sponsoring such programs will be wasting its scarce resources. The indifference on the part of the unions stems from its ambivalence toward accepting help from the university. That this kind of attitude can be overcome in both camps is attested to by the general success achieved in situations where a serious effort has been made to do so. Some notable examples are the university sponsored labor programs described in this report.

The importance of teaching in an effective liberal education program, as we discussed earlier, leads us to examine still another aspect of the university—the controversy within the university concerning the importance of teaching versus research. It is generally true that people, including union officials and labor education specialists, are impressed with the reputation of a professor based on his research activity, and automatically make the assumption that an outstanding research scholar will be a good teacher. Often, however, the reverse is more likely to be true. Many professors tend to neglect teaching in order to devote attention to research which will bring assurance of academic advancement. The fact is that while universities talk about the importance of teaching, they seldom promote professors who have a greater interest in teaching than in research.[13] Good teaching requires adequate preparation, including scholarly reading and research, but it seldom wins recognition except among students, and the evaluations of students not only have little weight, but are even resisted by the faculty. According to one critic of American higher education:

University Workers' Education Programs," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, vol. 5, no. 2 (January, 1952), p. 223.

[13] Theodore Caplow & Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (New York: Basic Books, 1958), p. 221.

The typical professor accepts this situation (downgrading of teaching) with resigned stoicism, just as he accepts age and sicknesses, and takes refuge with it in his own researches. It does not occur to him to try to make his classes as fascinating as a basketball game, or as pleasant as playing bridge in the student lounge. Indeed, the bitter truth is that, if he does try to make his students like his classes, his colleagues look askance at him as a "popularizer." He must be dull and hard if, in professorial eyes, he is to be great.[14]

This attitude that a teacher must be tough and dull to maintain his reputation as upholding academic standards is gaining increasing dominance in our universities, as faculty members achieve raises in rank and salary because of their research production rather than their teaching effectiveness.

In summary, how does this brief analysis of the university affect our subject: the kind of service the labor movement can expect from institutions of higher learning? Service remains the least honored activity of the university, not receiving a reasonable proportionate share of the institutions' resources; the growing preoccupation of the university with its research function operates to the detriment of the quality of teaching and public service; the lack of regard for good teaching means that many members of the faculty tend to develop a "trained incapacity" to be teachers, and particularly, teachers of culturally underprivileged adults.

It is up to the labor movement to insist upon receiving from the university the quality and quantity of service that it ought to have as a vital institution in our society. Such service is crucial if the labor movement is to improve the quality of its leadership and value in our country.[15] In light of the existing barriers, the trade unions will need to study how to exert pressure to get the kinds of help they need—a corps of teachers who know how to teach in labor education programs, appropriate teaching materials, training of teachers for other levels of labor education, experimentation with course ideas, research on improving the quality of labor education, and a firm commitment to sponsor and carry out a sound program of education for the labor movement.[16]

---

[14] George Williams, *Some of My Best Friends Are Professors: A Critical Commentary on Higher Education* (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1958), p. 102.

[15] While the labor movement no longer serves as a surrogate for humanity, and often strives to advance its own institutionalized aims at the expense of the common good, there is a need to restore the old idealism and principles that support the welfare of the common people which has characterized labor history in our country.

The labor movement will, however, also have to look to its own attitudes; it must itself accept a philosophy grounded in the conviction that workers can learn how to learn and to think clearly.[17] No one yet knows the limits of intelligence, nor the extent of man's potential for intellectual growth and development. We can believe that man can become more than he is, if properly motivated to develop a desire to learn how to learn. It is the degree of our motivation, after all, that seems to define the limits of our effectiveness in most areas of activity. In addition, the labor movement must realize that if it desires a truly liberalizing educational program for its members, it must reaffirm the sovereignty, dignity, and importance of the individual, as the central objective of its educational activities. With an educational philosophy of its own, the labor movement can participate with the university in planning a program of education, and hopefully through such cooperative effort, it will lose its own suspicions of the university.

Obstacles to Effective Learning among Workers

Our position with respect to the potential ability of workers to study in areas generally associated with higher education rests on a number of assumptions. The first is that the crucial ingredient in the intellectual growth and development of people lies in the character of their environment conditions.[18] It is useless to become involved in the controversy over the relative influence of inherited capacity to learn versus the environmental impact upon learning ability. In spite of the growing knowledge about human behavior, this controversy is far from resolved. A second assumption we make is that we do not yet know what the limits of human intelligence are. Although we often act as if we did, we do not know that the I.Q. score represents an individual's ceiling of intelligence. Most educators admit that we do not exploit all the potential ability of students, yet the overwhelming majority of teachers operate as if the achieved or demonstrated aptitude of students represents all that we can expect from them. This view tends to limit potential to what is actually achieved rather than to what may be possible under better motivating circumstances. And the great danger is that such an approach serves as a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy.[19] If we assume that an adult, who has had little formal education, such as our possible student in labor education, will perform at a low level of skill and ability in academic subjects, and this expectation is conveyed to him, even in the most subtle fashion, it is likely that he will perform at the expected level, and seem to be unable to go further. We shall contend, on the contrary, that if a teacher combines an objective appraisal with encouragement and reward for even the smallest kind of success, he may be able to increase the level of effort and achievement.

---

[16] It is our belief that the university should make appointments to its academic staff of Professors of Workers' or Labor Education, who could take a leadership role in a total educational program for the labor movement. To our knowledge, few universities have made such appointments, notably the University of Wisconsin.

[17] Some sociologists have reported upon the pragmatism and anti-intellectualism of workers and their inability to entertain abstract intellectual ideas. This finding relates to a static conception of the worker rooted in time and place but does not negate our belief that education can make a difference among working class adults in helping them develop the ability to entertain abstract ideas.

S. M. Miller and Frank Riessman, "The Working Class Subculture: A New View," Social Problems, vol. 9, no. 1 (Summer, 1961), pp. 86-97.

[18] See Patricia Cayo Sexton, Education and Income (New York: Viking Press, 1961) for an excellent discussion of the plight of the economically underprivileged child in our society, from the vantage point of a study of the Detroit public schools.

The fact that our performances tend to be limited by the nature of our self image, built up out of past experience, underlines the importance of examining critically our appraisal of the potential ability of human beings. The character of this evaluation is crucial in determining how we look upon the possibilities of liberal education for labor, and the conditions necessary for such education to be effective. If motivation defines effectiveness, as we believe, we must seek the means to increase motivation. The two important motivating sources for any type of task are interest in the job and confidence in the ability to get it done.[20] These two factors are closely related and reinforce each other. If we can build confidence, we can overcome the fear of learning that may have developed early in one's formal educational experience as a result of poor teaching, dull work, a culturally improvident environment, and study that is not clearly seen as related to one's life and interests. This kind of "fear" is not uncommon among students from the labor movement.

---

[19] Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, revised edition (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), ch. 11.

He first coined the phrase "self-fulfilling prophecy" after an observation by W. I. Thomas that "if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences."

[20] W. W. Sawyer, Mathematician's Delight (London: Penguin, 1943), pp. 40-54.

How do we build confidence? Nobody starts out in a new activity with complete confidence. He is able to develop it if he achieves some success early during the experience. Such success gives him pleasure, not only because it is always pleasant to be able to master something, but also, in part, because it produces admiration or respect from others. Thus, the successes that we achieve, buttressed by the admiration of others, serves to motivate us to go on in the activity, which makes mastery even more certain, and, in turn, produces further increase of interest and self-confidence.

The fear of learning is so common among adults (and again we must add, especially such adults as may come to us from the labor ranks) and is such a serious obstacle to learning, that it may be worth some further examination. Human beings strive for certain goals—self-esteem, self-respect, and a social position in some reference group.[21] Accordingly, they tend to avoid those areas of activity, whether on a conscious or unconscious level, where they have little confidence in their ability to succeed at their own standard of mastery. They are afraid to become involved because they do not want to appear foolish or incompetent. People tend to adjust to situations, in general, by repeating behavior that appears to be satisfactory and avoiding activity that may mark them as a failure. This process of adjustment often operates also in the learning situation, causing us to avoid subjects that we are not sure of mastering. We are afraid to try, because of our projection of fear or failure. But this doesn't mean that an individual couldn't master an activity that he avoids like the plague—if it weren't for the fact that he is afraid to try it.

There is ground for believing that the average adult, including the working class adult, has considerable potential, and that good teaching, proper environmental conditions, the inculcation of a sense of achievement, and appropriate incentives can serve to build motivation in an individual to help him realize that potential. The twin conditions for developing motivation, interest, and confidence, tend to reinforce each other—

---

21. T. Shibutani, Society and Personality (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961).

interest producing confidence which in turn helps to create greater interest. Thus, the task for an educational program is to organize activities so as to set this cycle in motion—to make possible some success at the beginning of any learning experience in order to reinforce self-confidence and build interest—the crucial conditions for the development of motivation. One way fear and lack of confidence can be eased is to make certain that our students have an adequate command of the learning skills,[22]—reading, writing, speaking, listening, and studying. We know that without them, an individual is seriously handicapped, and in many instances this lack can be the most serious barrier to the development of self-confidence, interest, and success.

Building motivation to learn, we are saying, is a very complex undertaking. If we assume that our potential students can't learn, we are creating a self-fulfilling prophecy, insuring support of our assumption. On the other hand, if the labor educator, in and outside of the university, believes in the potential for intellectual growth and development among workers, he too may be able to create a self-fulfilling prophecy. But he will also have to make sure that he offers meaningful educational activities and finds teachers that know how to work within them.

Conclusion

Our basic thesis in this paper has been that workers have the potential for intellectual growth if involved in carefully planned liberalizing educational experiences. We stressed the importance for educators in this area to develop faith in the ability of workers to learn how to learn, if they wish liberal education for labor to become a reality. When we looked at the university, we expressed our concern over a continuing tendency to stress the importance of research at the expense of teaching and public service. Since teaching is an important service needed by labor, we were concerned at the deterioration of the quality of teaching in institutions of higher learning. In the arena of public service, higher education has a very poor record with respect to providing service to the labor movement—if this is compared to the services given to business, industry, government, and agriculture.[23] Another deficit pointed out, in assessing the actual and potential role of the university in labor education, was the growth of an aristocratic ideal of education, a kind of elitism which holds that only a small percentage of our population can profit from higher education, and by definition the mass of the working class are eliminated.

---

[22] The British Workers' Educational Association has published a number of pamphlets designed to help its students secure some of the needed learning skills. A correspondence course has been built around the pamphlet "How To Be a Student" by A. J. Corfield. Other booklets are: W. E. Styler, "How To Study," and Raymond Chapman, "How Shall I Write It?" There are many American publications designed for college students which can be adapted for labor education students.

On the positive side, there are a few universities who have seriously engaged in providing educational activities for workers at a much higher level of institutional commitment than commonly exists. There are some academics who place a very high value on the importance of the labor movement in maintaining and extending our democratic society. Some outstanding teachers still preside in the halls of higher learning, and labor educators must find ways of identifying them, and using them in teaching workers.

An ideal approach to the organization of labor education programs would make use of other educational agencies, in addition to the universities.[24] The public high schools, the junior colleges, and the unions themselves would be involved in an over-all effort to utilize all existing educational resources to improve the quality and extent of labor education.

The very rapid social, technological, and economic changes that we are experiencing have produced profound effects upon trade unions, and emphasize the importance of labor itself becoming committed to extended education of union officers and members, if organized labor is to survive and grow. But this commitment must be to a liberalizing educational program which stresses the human dignity of the person as the end, rather than the use of the individual as a means to the end of the trade union organization. Trade unionists must have a conviction that their organizations serve, and will continue to serve, a vital function in the preservation of our democratic society, and that liberalized labor education programs will increase the importance and effectiveness of organized labor as it competes with other large scale organizations of business, industry, government, and special interest groups in our society. And of major importance is the necessity for labor to learn how to exert pressure on institutions of higher learning to obtain the kind of services it needs and deserves to improve and expand its programs of education.

---

[23] An example of how the university often serves special interest groups, at the expense of the public, was brought to our attention in the case of an Agricultural Extension Division's increasing its service to commercial agricultural interests as a matter of policy. Obviously, this is reducing service to the traditional clientele of agricultural extension —the farmers and their families. In testimony before the Michigan Legislature, President John A. Hannah, of Michigan State University, declared that ". . . services to management far outnumber and outweigh services to labor unions."

John A. Hannah, "The People's Colleges," The American Federationist (November, 1961), p. 31.

[24] For a fuller discussion of a plan for the organization of labor education, see Jack London, "Goals for Workers' Education," School for Workers—35th Anniversary Papers (Madison: University Extension Division of The University of Wisconsin, 1960), pp. 84-101.

THE UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

Anne L. Gould

University of California

LIBERAL ARTS FOR LABOR

A series of non-residential semester courses, on a variety of subjects (in addition to residential conferences), especially oriented to a labor audience, are offered through the Liberal Arts for Labor Program to all levels of union membership. Sensitive handling of all aspects of programming, based on carefully built in mechanisms to reveal reactions of teachers, students, and the program's union advisory committee, is perhaps the most impressive part of this generally impressive program.

The program, four years old at the time of this report, was initiated following a recommendation from the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults that the Department of Liberal Arts experiment with a liberal education program designed especially for union members. This report presents the highlights, the more important experiments, and the lessons that were learned in this well-rounded program of liberal adult education.

Anne L. Gould was the Coordinator of the Liberal Arts for Labor Program from its inception until 1961.

The prospectus for this publication asked contributors, in addition to a description of their individual programs, for an analysis of the "values aimed at by the university, by the union, and by the individual participants." The implication, not a novel one, is that a division in educational values and goals exists among these three. It seems to the writer that such a view stems from the erroneous assumption that unions have needs so esoteric that a broad educational background does not serve them; that unions require only that their members know a few facts and techniques related to union operations and goals; and, as is sometimes implied, that if a union man were given the calibre of education that helped to give him access to new ideas and to acquire the ability of analytical thought this would turn him against or away from the union movement.

A few comments on these points will serve also to explain the rationale and purpose of the Los Angeles program.

It is our assumption that a university, when it performs its functions best, wants to produce a man of broad knowledge, with the ability to read analytically and to think. It also gives him the opportunity for professional training. The individual, if encouraged, wants to develop to his maximum capacity so that he can have competence in areas that interest him and thus lead a fuller, more useful, thus richer life. The labor movement, concerned with its members' welfare, involved in social programs of national and international scope which demand membership understanding and support, also needs and must want the same things. The unions need members with the broad educational background and intellectual training available at the university and college level, education that will make them an asset to themselves, their union, and their community. The educational goals and values of the three are one and the same.

In opposition to this point of view, there is the theory, operative in labor education for over 30 years, that education for union members must be "practical," and "practical" has been equated with courses in so-called "tool subjects" only. This theory is widely supported by policy-making labor officers who have not stopped to examine whether a program which was perhaps "practical" in the 20's and 30's (when labor's main effort had to be directed toward organizing new workers, to establishing sound union organizations, to teaching millions of new members how unionism functions) may not now, thirty years later with operations and emphasis markedly altered, have become the most impractical of all programs.

A labor movement that at one time could restrict its operations to collective bargaining only, and that, moreover, drew heavily from its own ranks for the actual daily work of the union, could perhaps restrict its educational program to "how to do it" classes: how to bargain collectively; how to write a contract; how to handle grievances; how to conduct a meeting. One could, however, present some powerful arguments against the adequacy of such an educational approach even within such a limited situation.

But we are now in the 60's, and most of the union's work is done by specialists, either employed from the outside or trained on-the-job, and the proportion of union members involved in these operations grows smaller as unions grow larger. And few trade unions any longer restrict their operations to simple bargaining. They have moved officially from such strictly bread-and-butter operations to concerned involvement and activity in the broad social problems of our society, and they have become actively engaged in helping to fashion our nation's domestic and foreign policies.

It would seem obvious, therefore, that the kind of educational program needed to help implement present union operations is one based on the broadest kind of curriculum, with courses that help both the union officer and the union member (many of whom left school in early adolescence) to gain understanding of themselves, of their fellow-man, of the society in which they live, and of the role now possible for labor—given a membership and officialdom equal to the task. What is needed, today, is the addition of a broad program in the social sciences and the humanities. In fact, an entirely new approach is needed, and has been needed these many years.

The absence of such a new approach, and the continuance of the "traditional" program restricted to tool subjects, have done more than merely produce a stagnant program in a fast-moving world; it has discouraged union member participation in continuing education of any kind. Except for a relatively small group of stewards who take steward training, union members, by and large, finding themselves uninterested in the kinds of classes offered, have stayed away from educational activities. A myth has therefore grown and spread, and gained acceptance by labor leaders, by universities, and unfortunately by large portions of the membership itself, that union members are not interested in education, do not want it, will not respond to it.

While we acknowledge the present unfavorable climate for education in labor's ranks, we question the myth, believing that there do exist within labor's ranks scores of intelligent men and women who, if offered a program of courses on challenging subjects, on issues of concern to them, would respond positively to it; provided, however, that these courses were presented in a stimulating fashion and at a mature level, and were designed to give greater understanding and competence with respect to the important questions of the day.

Such was the rationale underlying the Liberal Arts for Labor program in Los Angeles, accepted by a group of progressive, forward looking labor officers, and supported over the four years by an increasing number of unions in the area, surely a noteworthy fact for those concerned with educational goals for labor.

In the brief account which follows, an attempt has been made to highlight some of the key events, to describe how the program was organized and developed, and to point out some of the major problems faced, and the lessons learned.

INITIAL STEPS

In the fall of 1957, the Department of Liberal Arts of the Extension Division of the University of California at Los Angeles, offered its liberal arts discussion-group program to labor. In early conversations about this plan, within the department, both interest and doubt were expressed. The department wanted labor in the program, were ready to do something special for it, but looked on it as an "experiment": "We'll try it for a year or two and see." (The writer was to hear dubious comments repeated often during the first year or two. On the campus, for example, some instructors, though sympathetic, suggested: "Labor doesn't want education; a few tool subjects, perhaps; even there, enrollment is poor; but education, no.")

The Department of Liberal Arts had a special reason for their doubts. For the four previous years, the department had been conducting one of the more successful liberal arts discussion-group programs in the country. About a year earlier, a study had been made of the enrollees, which showed that most participants had had some college work or were college graduates, that in the main they were professionals, businessmen, white collar workers, and housewives. Labor was conspicuous by its absence. Was it lack of interest, or was there another reason? Under the prodding of CSLEA, the special trial effort was decided upon.

During our early conversations with key labor officials, we encountered the same skepticism that we had met in the university. Previous attempts at such programs, they warned, had failed to materialize; or had started well and collapsed; interest was hard to get and harder to sustain. There was, however, full agreement about the need for education, perhaps the need for a new kind of education. There was an awareness also that changing conditions were bringing with them new and more complex problems, and some kind of help was needed if labor's social program was to be effectively interpreted and implemented. Labor leaders approved of a program specifically designed for labor, provided that they were involved as equal partners; and they were willing to try the new approach. We were encouraged to proceed, although it was obvious that there would be many problems and difficulties ahead.

ORGANIZING THE "EXPERIMENTAL" PROGRAM

In November 1957, as operations began several policy decisions had to be agreed upon. With the University Department, it was agreed:

1) that the labor program would not be confined to using the methods, or the "package" materials of the current discussion-group programs, but would be allowed to develop a content and methodology suited to labor's special needs;

2) that this would be a liberal arts program, with a liberal arts approach to any subject area covered;

3) that the closest working relationship possible would be developed with the labor movement, including the establishment of a Labor Planning Committee with whom we would work as full partners in this project.

With the labor movement, in conversation with the secretaries of the two councils (merger had not yet taken place in L. A. between CIO and AFL), it was agreed that a formal letter of proposal would be sent to the councils, requesting cooperation and the naming of representatives to the planning committee. The details of the program, it was understood, would be developed with this committee. The plans thus made would then be submitted for approval and endorsement.

Within a month, the proposal had been accepted; delegates had been named, and the Labor Planning Committee began meeting. The co-ordinator made it clear that there was no ready-made program waiting for rubber-stamp approval, but that the committee would be expected to help develop the program's scope and activities. The committee approved this, indicating that they would look to the co-ordinator for proposals, for ideas on courses and available campus resources, and then they would add their own ideas. The decisions reached would, of course, be subject to the necessary approval from labor and the university. The co-ordinator also looked to the committee for aid in presenting the program, and steering it through organizational channels. Policy for complete joint action was thus established.

The importance of a good committee must be stressed. If composed of people of stature in their unions, with the ability to get things done, the committee can be a source of great strength. Such was our Labor Planning Committee, especially during the first two years of operation. They were an excellent two-way channel of communication and interpretation. They became enthusiastic supporters of the program, and were effective in promoting and recruiting in their own locals, and through their regional offices.

EARLY PROGRAM DECISIONS

The early plans and decisions, listed below, reflect the necessary willingness to experiment, the search for new methods, the flexibility in attitude, which contributed so much to the program's acceptance and growth.

1) It was decided to launch the program dramatically, at a weekend residential conference at the University's Center at Lake Arrowhead. The theme, "The New Age—Its Moral and Political Implications for Labor," was selected as a vehicle broad enough to offer a first-hand experience with liberal arts.

2) After the Arrowhead conference (which proved to be highly successful) we proceeded immediately with an evening program, experimenting with ten session semester courses meeting weekly for two hours.

3) It was decided that, although a request from a union for a special class of its own in liberal arts would not be refused, unions and students would be urged to participate in the general classes. The Arrowhead conference had clearly demonstrated the tremendous advantage and the added educational benefits of inter-union classes.

4) Special classes for officers were discussed, but it was agreed to hold these in abeyance for the present, and to experiment with classes composed of officers and members from a variety of unions, in order to

expose students to the multiple viewpoints and opinions such a group would bring into a classroom.

5) With respect to method, it was decided that neither the discussion method alone, nor the lecture method by itself was suitable; the former, because it required an educational background presently lacking in this audience, and the latter because it would not involve participants enough to produce the best results. We decided, therefore, to test a format that combined lecture and discussion, giving students an opportunity to acquire new ideas from the professor during the lecture hour and, in the discussion period, through involvement in consideration of these, a chance to learn to understand them and to relate them to their own experience.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

After the first residential conference at Arrowhead, our general format was fairly well set: residential conferences to be held at least once a year, and a number of ten-week courses each regular semester.

In the first semester, beginning in April 1958, we offered four courses; that fall, we scheduled seven courses, of which six classes were held.

In January of 1959, with a year of experience behind us, we held a special weekend residential conference for "Labor and Educators" at Lake Arrowhead on the topic "An Educational Program for Labor in the 1960's—Goals and Problems." Our purpose was twofold: to promote understanding between labor officers and university educators, and to afford both groups an opportunity to discuss among themselves, and with each other, the problems and goals that concerned them, and to give us the benefit of their ideas. Twenty-five educators from five campuses and twenty-five labor officers from as many unions participated.

In February, 1959, we held the second Annual Liberal Arts Conference, following it with 13 courses offered in the spring semester (of which 10 classes were held), and, in the fall, nine courses (12 classes held).

In 1960, the third Annual Liberal Arts Conference was followed by a spring program of 11 courses offered (16 classes held), and nine courses in the fall (14 classes held). In the spring of 1961, the seventh semester, six courses were offered and eight classes held. In 1961, instead of the regular annual conference, we experimented with a new idea—a series of three weekends—about which we will have more to say later on.

The variation in the number of courses offered over the years requires a brief explanation. The increase from four courses in the first semester, to seven in the second, and thirteen in the third was due in part to our desire to experiment with courses in various subject areas, and partly to a decision that we must actively encourage the program's growth. If we were to overcome the poor climate for labor education, we felt that an active promotion campaign, and a program varied enough to meet many needs and interests, were needed. The results were good: enrollment increased steadily and interest in the program grew. Requests for classes were coming from the outlying areas, and from many parts of the state.

By the end of the fifth semester, however, it became clear that it was not enough simply to offer classes, particularly in new areas. More staff was needed to promote these courses. At this point, however, with the program showing signs of healthy growth, budgetary considerations took precedence, and it became apparent that there would be no additional staff. The growth which might have taken place did not; instead, we were forced to retrench. Enrollment figures are revealing. In 1958, 190; in 1959, 374; in 1960, 451. In 1961, with the reduced program, 153. For the residential conference at Arrowhead, the enrollment pattern was similar: first conference, 66 delegates from 33 local unions; second conference, 92 delegates from 48 unions; third conference, 109 delegates from 69 unions, with over 60 requests for reservations refused for lack of space. The increase in the number of participating local unions, evident in the Arrowhead conferences, was reflected also in the semester programs.

THE RESIDENTIAL CONFERENCES: LESSONS WE LEARNED

The first Arrowhead Conference, in 1958, taught us many things. As already stated, we saw this conference as a dramatic way to introduce liberal arts to a union audience, in a setting which would give us an opportunity to find out whether union members were interested in such education, or whether their reaction would be to reject it as "impractical."

The 66 participants at this Conference came from 33 local unions, and included full-time officers, part-time elected officials, board members, active rank-and-filers, international and regional representatives. They were men and women, ranging in age from 20 to over 60, and they represented a great variety of unions—building trades, teamsters, oil workers, white collar workers, communication workers, auto workers, and printers, to mention but a few.

Our subject "The New Age—Its Moral and Political Implications for Labor" proved excellent for a liberal arts presentation, and for an examination of several important current issues. The speakers included an eminent physicist, a philosopher, a political scientist, and an adult educator.

It was a hardworking conference. In spite of many possible diversions, attendance was nearly 100 percent at all sessions. The Friday night session with the physicist lasted until almost midnight; the speaker finally pleaded fatigue. Only two sessions had originally been scheduled for Saturday, but the participants requested and got an extra session Saturday night. The final (evaluation) session Sunday confirmed the interest apparent throughout the weekend.

The question we placed before the group at this last session was: "Now that you have had an opportunity to experience several liberal arts sessions, what is your opinion? Is this too offbeat, too impractical for you labor people?" The answer from every side of the room was, "No, this is education; this is practical education for us too; give us more." For two hours, men from various unions took the floor and spoke eloquently, giving their reasons for these opinions.

Other questions too were answered that weekend. The necessity for a separate labor program was clearly established. And the value of the multi-union representation was confirmed. For these men and women, most of whom rarely have more than the merest casual contact with officers and members of other unions, the opportunity to discuss important social issues within the greater labor family, was an added important experience.

In May and June of 1961, as we mentioned earlier, we tried out a new idea for our residential program. We offered a series of three weekends to a selected group of 40 labor officers, all of whom had previously participated in the program, asking them to enroll for all three. Only one topic and one instructor were scheduled for each weekend, to allow participants an opportunity to delve deeply into the subject and into the instructor's viewpoint. The same high interest was apparent here as in the other conferences. In addition, there was an unusually high level of discussion. Orwell, Tawney, and Galbraith were read and analyzed, articulately and with sophistication. Participants took pride in the group's accomplishment, and observers found it hard to believe that these were the same men who four years earlier had confessed to "not having opened a book in years."

THE CLASS PROGRAM: PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Problem I—The Right Instructor

The proper instructor, we found, was crucial to the success of the program. After the first two semesters, we could see a "profile" of the kind of instructor needed in this program.

In addition to having an excellent academic background and a mature viewpoint, he has to have a love of teaching and the ability to establish rapport with this student body. A man can be outstanding on campus, world-renowned in his field, and yet be completely unsuited to this audience. He has to be flexible, too, at least to the extent that he is willing to experiment with course content and to try a variety of materials and methods in his presentations. An outright pro-labor attitude, we found, was of far less importance than an interest in the students as people, and a general sympathy for the goals of labor.

An "unsuitable" instructor, in this program, can turn out to be more than merely a poor choice. He can be disastrous. On the campus, in credit courses, undergraduates may shrug an unsatisfactory teacher off as bad luck; in this program, a class may disappear.

A program designed for labor will not survive: if instructors will never pause for discussion; or, if they are unable to make their material come alive; or, if they underestimate the intelligence of their audience; or, if they lack tact and a sympathetic understanding of people; or, if they cannot tolerate any disagreement with their own point of view. All of these problems we encountered. But fortunately, the Liberal Arts for Labor program was also well endowed with some very fine teachers, who gave of themselves unstintingly, in extra hours spent searching for and preparing special materials, in meetings with us and with students. For many of them, it was their first experience with a union group, and they found it rewarding and stimulating because they could see that something important was happening to their students.

Problem II—Teaching Methods and Related Problems

We gave much thought to establishing a format that would provide a friendly atmosphere in which the student would feel at ease. We wanted to dispel anxiety, yet stimulate and involve him in the class activities, so that he would be challenged to read and to participate at the following session. The lecture-discussion combination, once we overcame our initial difficulty in finding instructors who understood and could use it, proved excellent. The presentation of ideas in the first hour helped the student to acquire a body of knowledge. In the second hour, with guided discussion, he learned to analyze another's argument, to state and defend a position with ideas and facts, to stay on the point; the discussion hour encouraged disciplined thinking and reading.

Instructors had to cope with two troublesome problems. One was the 'excusable absence'; i.e., "the union meeting from which I can't be absent," or the rotating swing shift. Some classes were little troubled by this; in others it was a disconcerting problem.

The second was the wide variation in educational backgrounds to be found in any one class. In some classes, educational levels ranged from sixth grade elementary school to one year of college. It was necessary to find a level of instruction to serve this heterogeneous group. The obvious answer, had budget permitted, would have been counselling, and the separation of students into basic and advanced groups. Failing this, the instructors did the best they could, giving extra assistance when requested, recommending more reading to the top students, etc.

As the program progressed, this problem eased considerably—at least for the abler students. We began offering a progression of courses and more advanced work in classes such as "Contemporary Ideas," "Law and You," "Ethical Problems," "Logic in Practice." It was gratifying to see the students who re-enrolled for several semesters, even those who previously had shown that they were working under a handicap, begin to hold their own in class discussion and to handle the material with competence.

Another technique we used, which is perhaps worth mentioning, is the semester evaluation session. In the first four semesters, these were held once a term, on a Saturday, on the campus. More than half the students attended, even though the distance most of them had to travel was very great. The students felt that it was an important part of the program, that it gave them an opportunity to review what had happened to them during the semester, and to tell us what improvements they felt were needed in the program. For the administrators, instructors, and planning committee members who attended, it served to provide an excellent "feed-back" of student reaction.

Problem III—Materials and Course Content

Obviously we could not use the standard "college course 1A or 2B" of any department; nor could we use the average college text for this audience. The instructor had to develop a special course content based on what we might reasonably expect this group to handle in 20 hours, considering the limited time they had for home study. In general, during the first two semesters, we over-estimated and attempted too much.

Finding appropriate materials, adequate for mature treatment of the subject, yet readable, and at a price within the student's means, was a perplexing and time-consuming job. The search for materials went on continually during the first few semesters. For some of the courses, such as "Philosophy of Unionism," "Law and You," "Public Opinion and Propaganda," we assembled, excerpted, culled and developed what amounted to special texts. Instructors contributed a prodigious amount of time to this work. When paperbacks began to offer more titles in the social sciences, the problem was eased considerably.

As better or more appropriate materials came to our attention, these were incorporated and to a degree influenced course content. Most of our courses were revised two and three times, not only in response to student reaction, as observed in class and in the evaluation sessions, but also when especially fine material was found that suggested new departures.

Although courses in the humanities were offered too from time to time, we stressed the social sciences as subject areas of immediate interest. We planned to stress the humanities in later semesters.

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM

How does one judge the impact of a program such as this one in three and a half years? Lacking funds for evaluative studies or for followup on students, we have only the following incidents that came to our attention, to offer as an indication of impact.

. . . The program's growth in the number of students and the number of union locals participating, must be assumed to indicate that the reports from students to their fellow union members were highly positive, indicating that these classes had real meaning for them.

. . . Union locals paid student tuition fees; in some locals the number of such fees paid grew from one or two in the first semester to as many as fifteen in later semesters.

. . . The response to the evaluation sessions is another clue to impact. Working men and women gave their Saturdays, travelled one or two hours to the campus, and spent the day re-assessing what they had learned and giving us their criticism. Would they have gone to this trouble, unless something meaningful were happening to them?

. . . Many of the instructors also came to these evaluation sessions. Would they, under no compulsion to attend, have given this extra time, unless they saw something important happening to their students?

. . . The secretary of a local found himself involved in negotiations in San Francisco in the middle of a term; we discovered that on the night of his class he would take a plane to Los Angeles, attend class, and return to his meeting the following morning. When we offered to send his assignments home, he refused: "I'm too involved in what's going on in class; I thought I knew this field (Social Problems) but I'm learning about ideas and viewpoints I never knew existed."

. . . We have a letter from an oil worker that his class cost him $95.00 in lost wages. He was on a rotating shift, working days one week and nights another; rather than miss class, he took five nights off in the ten week semester.

. . . In the seventh semester, we experimented with a new course called "Contemporary Ideas," open only to former students. The new format included one session of lecturing, alternating with one session of discussion. Readings included: Galbraith, Affluent Society; Fromm, Sane

Society; Lubell, Future of American Politics; Bronowski, Science and Human Values. The students' ability to handle these readings, to criticize, to deal with and apply abstract ideas, to defend a position, was excellent. The discussions were equal to, and at times even better than, those at many graduate seminars the writer has attended.

. . . The Secretary of a Provision Workers' local who called to enroll six men, said, "I'm real pleased with the progress the two I sent last semester are making; you can really see the results when they take the floor; I hope to send ten next semester."

. . . A number of the younger men began to organize education committees and programs in their local unions; a couple of them collected libraries for the locals.

. . . From at least a dozen of our younger members we received letters and phone calls informing us that they were resuming their formal schooling, enrolling in courses for credit. There may have been others; we knew only of those who let us know that, although not enrolled in the labor program, they were continuing their education.

Our files contain many more letters and evaluation sheets which confirm these, and scores of incidents like them. Is this impact? We think it is. Intangible though it is, it will have an effect on the labor movement if the program continues to grow, and reaches a sufficient number of people.

THE BIG PROBLEM AND IMPLICATIONS

The most burdensome task of the program has been recruiting students. This problem has several aspects, which have a direct bearing on the rationale for the program, and thus merit some attention.

The average union member, with schooling over by the time he is in his mid-teens, can hardly be said to be educated for the complex problems he faces as an adult in today's world. While many left school for solely economic reasons, many others left because of personal reactions to school. For these, the return to "school" requires overcoming a real hurdle. This feeling was confirmed to us in many conversations with union men and women.

Reaching the union member in a way that will help him to overcome the old fears, and the reluctance to "return" to school, and to replace these with an awareness of the importance of education to himself as a person and to his union, can be achieved only if the two institutions involved—the union and the university—are determined to do it. Both of these institutions have barriers to overcome; both, however, have a stake in the success of such an educational endeavor.

With respect to the unions, it is obvious, that although many union leaders, today, are eager to try new educational programs, others still retain old attitudes. They are ambivalent on the subject of education: they are for free education and equal educational opportunities, but for the young; the continuing education of adults, they feel, is not their concern. Or, if the union is involved, they say, education ought to be "practical," without examining what "practical" really should mean. Some are even hostile ("Why should I build my competition?"). Some are too busy with details of office to give this problem the necessary attention. And some, even if they are for it, do not quite know how to "sell" a program of liberal education.

Is a liberal education for union men and women really "impractical" —a luxury? A look at a few of the problems facing labor might indicate the answer.

During and following World War II, when the government called on labor to designate people with the background and competence to take on responsible assignments, the trade unions found that they lacked an educated personnel in sufficient numbers to serve both the labor movement and the country. Yet labor demands a greater share in policy making at the community and national levels. Does this not mean that labor must do something to raise the educational level of its members and officers?

Had there been a constructive approach to education before and after World War II, might not labor have been better equipped to handle the "right-to-work" battles of the mid-50's? Even in those states where the costly propaganda campaigns were effective in defeating the enemies of labor, what has been done to insure that these victories are permanent? Can this be done except through education which aims at an understanding of the role of labor in a pluralistic society?

Is it not time for labor to examine realistically its operations and goals, and to look ahead at the society it will face in the next decade?

The problems created by automation, to take one example, will become more serious, but so may the benefits if we can know how to use them properly. This challenge cannot be met by slogans, nor can it be turned over to government committees alone. An understanding, based on in-depth study of our society and the forces at work within it, is needed at the grass-roots level as a prerequisite for sound action. How can this be accomplished but by education? The same kinds of questions can be raised with respect to many other current and emerging problems which face the labor movement.

When we look at the university, we find problems and a similar disinclination to face the underlying issues. The tax-supported universities and colleges have a responsibility in this area which they cannot ignore. The "ivory tower" charge can no longer be made with justification against these institutions of higher learning; their concern and involvement with society's problems is evident both at the level of the individual educator and the institutions themselves. Witness the many excellent programs designed for special groups. But, with rare exceptions, one looks in vain for labor programs of size and scope equal to the need; or if some program is being carried on, it is usually a "shoestring" operation, a "token program." One can almost argue, and with some justification, that these may well be worse than nothing at all, since they help by their static, limited approach, to perpetuate the myth that "union members do not want education."

This state of things does not mean that the universities are anti-labor, as some labor officials seem to think; but rather that the same lack of realistic re-examination of the social situation exists here as in many labor unions. Granted that labor programs are difficult to organize and that they do not bring in the income required of adult programs, should not educational needs dictate programs rather than "ability to pay"? On what basis should education be withheld? And if "class income" becomes the yardstick, what greater cost to the community results?

One of these two institutions must take the initiative to move ahead in liberal labor education. And logically, it is the educators, with the necessary knowledge, resources, and stature, who can and should seek to establish relationships with labor officers, to open organizational channels, and make programs of education possible. There are today in labor's ranks many thoughtful officers deeply concerned about the problems here mentioned (and others not discussed because of space limitations), who would cooperate in such a venture.

The Liberal Arts for Labor Program in Los Angeles, by achieving an enrollment of over 1,400 union members in classes and conferences over a three and a half year period, proved that such programs have an audience; it also demonstrated that the related problems can be solved: finding dedicated, enthusiastic instructors; assembling appropriate materials; designing effective class formats; and even recruiting students —if there is adequate budget and staff. Whether such programs will be widely established will depend in large measure on the determination of labor and the state colleges and universities to make available to labor equal educational opportunities, equal that is, to the fine programs, tax deductible, thus tax supported, which are currently available to executives in various institutions throughout the country.

Emery F. Bacon

United Steel Workers
of America

FOURTH YEAR INSTITUTE: THE WORLD OF IDEAS

The culminating institute, in a series of four yearly two-week residential seminars, the Steelworker's *Fourth Year Institute: The World of Ideas* is specifically devoted to the liberal arts. Works in the humanities and the social sciences form the basis for consideration of contemporary ideas and ideals, practices and values. The full program of four yearly institutes (the first three deal in turn with tool subjects, citizenship, and leadership) is open to steelworkers at all levels of the union.

One of the first major unions to recognize that new social conditions were requiring labor to expand its educational commitment, the United Steel Workers of America, in 1945, embarked upon its long range experiment in many-faceted educational programming for its membership. The four-year institute program is part of a broad educational plan.

Emery F. Bacon is the Director of the Department of Education of the United Steelworkers of America.

Education has followed a curious pattern in the United States. For a country founded upon principles of equality and democratic procedures, little has been done through education to safeguard either.

With minor exceptions, education in the United States is pragmatic in orientation. As an industrial nation, we require a citizen work force that can read, write, and figure; we have taught these skills to nearly all our people. Yet, appallingly, we find few who enjoy either reading or writing. In 1961, there are still more blacksmith shops than there are bookstores in our country. The professions and the sciences competing with each other, have established schools of great importance and have produced men competent in their respective fields; but these men are also frequently inadequate in their concern for man, truth, justice, and beauty. A few men struggle to maintain humanistic education, but prefer to reserve it for a privileged elite. The custodians of this humanistic heritage tend to ignore its true potential and, instead of strengthening the force of liberal education in American life, through broad, general support, weaken it by restriction and isolation.

The goals most men seek have little in common with the wisdom of the ages. The good society has become a society of goods. Freedom of enterprise has taken precedence over the enterprising free man, with a consequent diminishing of personal liberty and the substituting of conformity. Utilitarian values too frequently rank higher than esthetic and humanitarian needs. We lag in our devotion to the arts, and even take a rough pride in our unwillingness to support them. We neglect the conservation of our national resources, and deliberately waste our human ones. Our school system remains impoverished while we show cynicism and scorn for the intellectual. We are preoccupied with trivia. In a confused world, with leadership thrust upon us, we lack the ideas, the men, and the conviction to solve both national and international problems.

Mistakenly, labor education has followed, for the most part, the limited patterns established by professional educators. While providing a plethora of courses aimed pragmatically at developing organizational strength and loyalty, coupled with a technical competency in labor-management relations, it has rarely touched the problems of the individual, nor provided him with insights into himself. Instead of being originators of humanistic ideas, labor educators have been designers of prosaic, problem-solving techniques, none of which can be more than transitory in a rapidly changing world.

A labor union is a complex organization, with many fixed and some changing goals. It is first of all a voluntary association of men, encouraged by law and institutions to be a countervailing force in an industrial society. Its legalistic purpose is to represent workers and to negotiate for them in the areas of collective bargaining. Its moral purpose is to involve workers through active participation in solving their own problems. But, a labor union must range far beyond its basic sanctioned purposes if it is to maintain its own vitality and to ensure for itself the continued support of its members. Indeed, the Constitution of the Steelworkers rather sweepingly states the purpose of the Union, in part, as follows:

"To engage in educational, legislative, political, civic, social, welfare, community and other activities; to advance and safeguard the economic security and social welfare of workers in industry . . . in the free labor movements of the United States, Canada, and the world; to protect and extend our democratic institutions and civil rights and liberties; and to propagate and extend the cherished traditions of democracy and social and economic justice in the United States, Canada and the world community."

Certainly these goals are a challenge to the humanists both within and without labor.

Education played a major role in organizing the Steelworkers Union during the mid 30's. It stressed the Union's responsibility to society: to dignify the individual, and to accelerate social progress. Industrial unionism's success depended largely upon the participation of the members it enrolled.

The first continuing effort in labor education in the Steel Union began in 1946 with the establishment of the Steelworkers' Institutes at Pennsylvania State College (now Pennsylvania State University), and its exceedingly important off-campus complementary classes. From this inception, the Union's education efforts have spread to 25 universities, where cooperatively-planned and administered programs continue throughout the entire year. The education program of the United Steelworkers of America is today an enterprise which involves over 5,000 men at the summer institutes, and approximately 75,000 in the winter classes.

The initial program in 1946 was designed for the practical needs of the Union and its members. It covered, with two minor exceptions, the subjects involved in running a labor organization and ensuring its effectiveness as an appropriate collective bargaining agent. The two exceptions were: lectures on public power and on building and furnishing a home.

The years gradually saw an expansion of the institutes to a second, a third, and finally, a fourth year program, all with fixed subject matter. In addition, an alumni program, operated exclusively for those who have completed the four-year program, ranges through topics of a wide variety. Based on an over-all theme, ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP, the first year retains the basic tool subject matter content; the second year deals with citizenship responsibility; the third with leadership; and the fourth with the world of ideas—with liberal, humanistic education revolving around man himself.

Not all universities have adopted the four-year program. Some have been reluctant because they felt unqualified, but more often, because the program did not conform to their preconceptions about adult education. Moreover, some district steel representatives have been equally hesitant, but for quite different reasons. Some argue that unless a course has a visible, practical application it is valueless. Others still feel the only purpose of labor education is to build strong loyalties to individuals or to movements; consequently, any program dealing with self enrichment, the arts, or ethical decision-making is considered frivolous.

Where the fourth-year liberal arts program has been instituted, it takes various forms and directions. No two universities offer, nor could they, the same courses or treatment. The ideas and content depend entirely upon the staff, the philosophy and interpretation given. As a result, there is a kaleidoscope of highly imaginative programs throughout the country.

It is too early to define precisely the goals of the fourth-year program. They are still changing. Yet, in a general way, it may be said that the ultimate purpose is threefold: 1) to stimulate participants to think critically about themselves as individuals and as members of an industrial society; 2) to open possible areas of creativity; and 3) to develop understanding of the values by which men live. It is assumed that these values are equally important to men as individuals, as union officers, and as citizens.

One of the early programs dealt mainly with literature and public issues. Through discussions, readings, and recordings, the students examined values as they are reflected in literary works and in contemporary public issues. Using definitions of ethics and responsibility, discovered from study of some of the best of English and American literature, the group sought to define their ideal individual, and then to compare his standards with those of members of the group. When established relationships were discovered between a system of values and public issues, the group sought to define an ideal society, and then to compare it with contemporary America. In the examination of public issues, the students considered such concepts as power, and its meaning and use; morality and its sources; the contradictions between individuals and leaders.

Max Goldberg, executive director of the Humanities Center for Liberal Education in an Industrial Society at Amherst, in Massachusetts, conducted the initial experiment on "Literature and Public Issues." He wrote an analysis of the project, in which he made the following revealing statement:

> "One of the most significant remarks about the fourth-year program was made by a Steelworker who became one of the enthusiastic members of the group and later an ardent supporter of the alumni program. He admitted he had been bewildered by the experience. He had sat patiently through the first and second meetings with the growing suspicion that although much of what was going on was of some interest, most of it was not at all useful to him and his union. I felt like saying, he said, 'What do you expect me to do, read poetry to the foreman on Monday morning when I go back?' By midweek, however, he had begun to see some things he had not thought of before. The experience began making sense. By the end of the week he thought he had learned many things that were good to know both as an individual and as a union officer."

It seems reasonably clear at this point that the experiments we have performed in the fourth-year program are at least partially successful in getting participants to look at some new ideas and to think about some of them in unaccustomed ways. Yet, there are undoubtedly many mature students, like the one Dr. Goldberg referred to, who are not able to see the relevancy of the material presented until late in the program. Yet interest invariably was aroused—not by having relevance pointed out but rather by the participant's noting applications on his own, and seeing them more fully and at a deeper level.

A. O. Lewis, professor of English at Pennsylvania State University, has headed the fourth-year program at that institution since its inception in 1957. He describes the liberal arts program in an article written in 1961, entitled, "Of Great Value to Society," as follows:

> "Although the specific themes and subject-matter of this fourth-year program have changed from year to year, the intent has remained constant through the five years of its existence: 'to stimulate the students to think critically about themselves as individuals and as members of an industrial society.'
>
> "Literature has been a field of study each year but literature used—to the dismay of some of my more conservative colleagues—as almost a social science, a means for illustrating something about our way of life. For two years, the associated subject was political science; for the last three years philosophy has provided material; and, in addition, last year there was psychology, and this year there is economics.
>
> "The faculty has never worried much about the amount of factual

> knowledge imparted, but has concerned itself with stirring up the kind of independent thinking that must be at the very heart of a free man in a free society. The program has been constantly experimental—no two sessions ever alike. Sometimes the experiments have produced dramatic results. I remember 1957, when Max Goldberg of the University of Massachusetts and Mort Gordon, now at the University of California, pioneered the program, and I listened to Max read most of The Old Man and the Sea, to a group of spellbound Steelworkers.
>
> "In 1958, Don Lloyd of Wayne State took apart one of his own poems, without telling the class it was his poem, and showed them more about the mind of the artist than one would have dreamed possible. In 1959, I remember, I was almost pushed through a blackboard—in friendly fashion, of course—by a large crane operator because I did not believe he had the nerve to read a poem by Robert Frost to his foreman. (I was pretending, because I knew he would, and he did.)
>
> "For the last two years, we have opened the program with a staged reading, last year of 'The Trial of Socrates,' directed by John Barry Wilder, and this year of 'The Adding Machine' directed by Gil Aberg. For two years now we have taken our class to the Mateer Playhouse and tied this new experience into the program.
>
> "The formal educational level of the class is lower than that of an ordinary college class, but these men are leaders, accustomed to saying what they think; as a result, we have often taken them further in one week than we could take undergraduates in a semester.
>
> "We have not used ordinary teaching methods: all members of the faculty are present in class together, and, teaching as a team, they complement and support each other so that problems are examined from several points of view simultaneously."

Dr Lewis concludes his article by saying this:

> "There are those who do not approve of the American labor movement. I wish they could meet some of our fourth-year program graduates. I know that Joe Scarazzo of Koppel, Ernie Clifford of Clairton, Ray Johnson of Sharpeville, and a hundred others—makers of steel—could show the scoffers what it means to be an educated, high-principled, intelligent leader of labor and of society. Penn State is doing the job for which it was founded."

We are often asked about the participants in the fourth-year program. While some among us believe that liberal education should have a primary place in labor education, and be offered in the first year, we have so far restricted it to two groups: 1) staff representatives of the International Union; and 2) members who have completed the first three years of the four-year program. It is our belief that a degree of maturity and sophistication is necessary before a man can understand and draw meaning from a liberal arts course. In a few instances, even the completion of the first three years has not been enough.

A certain amount of attrition occurs between the first and the final year, so that the fourth-year program has consequently considerably fewer participants than the earlier years. Even so, several hundred men are annually enrolled in the liberal arts program.

During 1961, we made a study of the Steelworker members attending the liberal arts program at one university. This is what we found:

The overwhelming majority of the students, nearly 90%, are in the age bracket between 30 and 50 years. Only 7% were between 21 and 35, and the balance, 3%, were over 51.

Of these, 65% had completed 12 years of formal education; 7% had done some college work, and the rest, 28%, had had somewhere between 6 and 11 years of formal schooling.

With respect to union membership, we found 40% had been in the union from 16 to 20 years; 45% from 21 to 25 years, and the balance, 15%, less than 15 years.

Most of the students are union officers, 50% are listed as grievance committeemen; 5% are presidents of their local; 7% are recording secretaries; 5% are treasurers, and 5% are financial secretaries.

Strangely enough, in spite of their age and long membership in the union, they are, in general, new office holders. Fifty-seven per cent have served less than five years, while only 32% have served from 6 to 10 years. Of the entire group, only one member was an officer for more than 11 years.

Thus our average student emerges as a man somewhere between 45 and 50 years of age. He has worked in the steel industry most of his life, and has been a member of the union all that time. His formal education is somewhat higher than that of the average steel worker, and he unquestionably has a desire to continue it throughout his adult life. A late starter in a sense, he did not secure union office until the "old guard" began losing its grip on union politics. He is a man who has seen great changes take place in the industry and in our society. He has leadership qualities and a desire to use them. He has strongly held ideas but is receptive to change. He participates in the affairs of his union and his society, and seems determined to prepare himself for even more active roles in both.

It is difficult to alter the trends of education. The inclusion of liberal studies in labor education may not cause a perceptible change within the structure of our society. Even its own existence may be a brief one, rejected by most labor leaders. But I think not.

Life presents us with many paradoxes. The rush of automation can be a great liberating force to free people from the machine, but it can also produce severe hardship for some who labor. A maturing society ought to produce the possibility of a more meaningful life, but sometimes all that happens is that we get richer. A generous economy should stimulate new interests in the arts and the intellectual life, and ensure a renewed respect for moral and ethical values; but instead it seems to threaten both by creating instead a commercially-oriented public spirit.

The decisions of the future are too important to be left to a very small elite. All of us must learn to know the problems that affect our homes, our communities, our jobs and our world, and attempt to find the wisdom to resolve them. Liberal education for workers can help.

In a free society, the individual's importance can no longer be neglected or ignored. His intelligent participation is a requisite for society's survival. A union's purpose is to aid men to find the way, through thoughtful, well informed action.

Our purpose, in the Steelworkers Program, is to plant a seed that may assist in making it all come true.

Irvine L. H. Kerrison

Rutgers University

THE INSTITUTE LABOR PROGRAM

Kerrison describes the Institute Labor Program as a "pyramid of services." At the base are the traditional labor education services (short courses, conferences, resident summer schools) to which new dimensions have been added through study in the humanities. Graduate programs and a special trade union certificate program are at the apex of the pyramid; and along the slopes are the programs offered by the Leadership Academy and an intern program for labor educators.

The major reason the Institute program has moved ahead, Kerrison says, is that at each point it has insisted upon true union-university cooperation, as a first principle. How this principle has been activated at Rutgers forms an important part of this report. Another is Kerrison's explanation of the criteria on which the programs are based, the validity of which, he says, experience has confirmed.

Irvine L. H. Kerrison is Director of Development and Professor of Management and Labor Relations at the Institute of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University.

Thirty-five years ago, Everett Dean Martin, then director of The People's Institute and teacher at the New School, saw unmistakable evidence among his countrymen of a thirst for the kind of education that offers more than information, skill, or propaganda—for education which permits one to take stock of his way of life and encourages, through self-criticism, self-mastery of the whole man.

The late master adult educator would recognize equally unmistakable evidence of worker thirst for that kind of education today.

While trade unionists still are primarily interested in academic disciplines which can be directly applied to their bread-and-butter bargaining table and political needs—economics, psychology, sociology, and political science—they also have a new-found interest in the humanities. Today this interest reflects their growing concern about problems such as space travel, integration, and the cold war. Tomorrow, as the atomic age with its promise of greater leisure moves ahead, they undoubtedly will become even more concerned with the humanities for the sake of the richer, fuller life they can help the individual achieve. Thus, there is need both today and tomorrow for new directions in labor education which will broaden and deepen its content.

The trade unionist who aspires to "whole man" status will have to advance his education in a systematic, comprehensive, integrated, and disciplined manner. His study will need to combine bread-and-butter subjects such as grievance handling with the social sciences, and the humanities—to help him become a more effective individual, a contributing member of his union, and a participating citizen in his community.

As part of total Institute development activity, under the direct administration of Labor Program Chairman, Herbert A. Levine, Rutgers is helping to develop a program of labor education[1] to meet the needs of that aspiring trade unionist.

The Institute Labor Program has moved ahead because it has insisted upon true union-university cooperation as the first principle essential to successful labor education. Only if universities and trade unions work together on a functional basis can that education be effective. The former bring to the common task the sum of man's knowledge in the academic disciplines; the latter bring professional experience, skill, and an understanding of the needs and problems of workers.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL

Rutgers, therefore, as early as 1949 gave serious consideration to the formation of a Trade Union Consulting Committee which would accept continuing responsibility for the quality, administration, and promotion of Institute Labor Program activities. While by the statute which created it the Institute was given an over-all State Advisory Council composed of labor, management, and public members in equal numbers, staff responsible for the labor program felt it inevitable that the labor members of the council would be primarily concerned with industrial relations rather than with labor education problems, would be status figures whose major responsibility would be broad policy matters, and would be individuals who would have neither the time nor, in many instances, the background to advise on specific labor education problems.

---

[1] For full details see Irvine L. H. Kerrison and Herbert A. Levine, Labor Leadership Education (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1960), and Irvine L. H. Kerrison, Workers Education at the University Level (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1951).

The labor members of the Council, however, were in a position to urge the establishment of a Trade Union Consulting Committee (TUCC), and in 1954 it was formally organized. Because of the close liaison maintained with them before formal organization of the TUCC, these labor members had seen the developing labor program in action and were convinced that they could commit themselves and their organizations to creation of the TUCC and to accepting the responsibilities it would bring.

Criteria for TUCC membership were worked out with them and with the unions with which the labor program was cooperating at the time.

It was agreed that TUCC members should (1) be named by cooperating labor groups, (2) be "local" in terms of the area covered by the university, and (3) include international representatives or organizers and state and county trade union officers who were fully cognizant of the educational needs of trade unionists in the economic, political, and social spheres; local union officers who were aware of all the day-to-day problems their members face; and trade union labor educators who could relate such needs and problems to the appropriate methods and techniques useful in reaching rank-and-file union men.

Once organized, the TUCC approved three operating principles for the labor program: (1) every activity to be planned jointly by the union and the university, (2) every activity to be designed to deal with the individual problems of the union group requesting service, and (3) close cooperation with the labor movement to be maintained through regular consultation with national, regional, and state union education directors and departments.

Today, the Rutgers TUCC has almost forty members, representatives of the state labor groups and international unions which the labor program serves. In addition, the labor members of the State Advisory

Council serve ex officio, and labor program chairman Levine serves as secretary. Members come from the following categories: international representatives (10); state or county trade union officials (9); local union officials (8); labor educators (10).

The TUCC has helped make possible sound analysis of labor education needs in New Jersey, has helped make known the ways in which the Rutgers labor program can meet those needs, has been particularly helpful with budgetary problems, and has helped develop a trade union interest in general university affairs.

Most important, TUCC's immersion in labor program planning and operations has made members as convinced as staff that together they must present a program, as broad and deep as possible, encompassing the humanities as well as the social sciences.

The program offers an integrated pattern of learning within which can be found both the traditional labor education services, and experiments in long-term training and education. It concerns itself not only with specific employment-contact problems, such as grievance handling and causes and control of absenteeism, but also with general social and economic problems, such as the implications of technological change, and balancing and proper use of manpower supply and demand in the crucial Sixties. It applies Rutgers University's research and teaching to solution of problems workers face as individuals, as union members, and as citizens.

TRADITIONAL SERVICES GIVEN NEW DIMENSION

To the traditional labor education services provided by Rutgers over the years (analysis of and advice upon specific education needs, classes, discussions, film showings, conferences and resident summer schools) we have tried to add new dimensions. An example is the successful Trenton Labor Discussion Program, conducted over the past two years with the cooperation of Institute librarian, Bernard Downey. Here unionists from both craft and industrial backgrounds, including rank-and-file, officers and staff, read and meet regularly to discuss critically such subjects as the poetry of Robert Frost and Carl Sandburg, "message" novels like Upton Sinclair's The Jungle, and the plays of Eugene O'Neill.

For twelve years Rutgers has conducted summer institutes in cooperation with the United Steelworkers of America.* Here, too, new depth has been added to traditional labor education programs. For third-year students, the whole spectrum of written communication as it applies to the problems and challenges of leadership is put forward. Among readings suggested is such varied fare as Immortal Poems of the English Language, edited by Oscar Williams; Ruth Benedict's Patterns of Culture; Herbert J. Muller's The Uses of the Past; Good Reading, edited by J. S. Weber for the Committee on College Reading; Mid Century, edited by Orville Prescott; and Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea.

Traditional labor education services such as the above form the base of a "pyramid of service" that Rutgers believes provides a pattern of integrated and progressive learning, the lack of which has for so long handicapped the development of labor education in the United States.

At the apex of the "pyramid" are the Trade Union Certificate Program (TUCP), a non-credit, two to three-year, disciplined, self-study program offered in cooperation with the University Extension Division; and, for the academically qualified individual, a Graduate Program (GP) leading to the degree of Master of Arts, offered by the Graduate School through the Institute and in cooperation with the Departments of Economics, Political Science, Sociology and Psychology.

On the slopes are activities such as the Union Leadership Academy (ULA), which offers training to union staff and local leaders, through the cooperative efforts of thirteen international unions, four departments of the AFL-CIO, and four universities; and the Labor Intern Program (LIP), which offers to a few mature, experienced trade union leaders, an opportunity to join the staff of the Labor Program for a period of three months to a year, to train intensively for the role of labor educators in their union when they return.

TRADE UNION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM OFFERED WITHOUT PREREQUISITES

While there are no formal educational requirements for admission to the TUCP, an applicant must convince the University Extension Division and the Institute that he, as an individual, can profit from the instruction—his experience, self-study, and previous formal work in labor education all are taken into account. To qualify for his certificate, the student must complete successfully a curriculum of studies equivalent to thirty credits taken over a minimum period of two years. The core curriculum is that required of all Rutgers certificate candidates—twelve credits in oral and written communication, basic economics, major concepts of modern psychology, and principles of political science. Both within this core, and in the balance of the curriculum, the student, in class and in his outside reading, studies extensively in such areas as philosophy, anthropology, and sociology.

---

*Ed. Note: See article on liberal education and the steelworkers union, p. 43 of this document.

The Graduate Program applicant must meet the admission requirements of the Graduate School, and of the department in which he will do his major work. In addition, he must present a background in areas such as the following (or an equivalent): 1) research specialist responsible for collecting and analyzing data relevant to collective bargaining, 2) union staff member responsible for organizing or servicing, at the local union level, political education activity, or labor education programming.

To qualify for his degree, the student must successfully complete thirty-six credit points, twenty-four in his major department and six in a related academic discipline. He must also take the interdepartmental seminar, the purpose of which is to bring to bear on his particular interests, the concepts and tools of the several social sciences. Finally, he must undertake related field projects, and write a thesis based on personal investigation of the specific trade union problem with which he is most concerned. The objective is to combine solid grounding in one of the social sciences with broad understanding of the applicability of social science principles and techniques to problems faced by labor, and to the particular problem of the individual student.

Rutgers plans to broaden the GP by extending the present cooperative relationship between the Institute and the Graduate School to other departments within the university including, of course, the humanities.

UNION SERVICE EMPHASIZED BY THE UNION LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

The ULA provides a minimum of four years of educational activity for the leader who wishes to do more for his union than assist with negotiation and administration of the contract. It differs from the TUCP, in part, by emphasizing training for broad service to the union, rather than education to develop the individual.

The first objective of the ULA is the development of local leaders, whose functions reflect in miniature most of the basic and essential trade union functions with which both the parent international and the AFL-CIO are, today, necessarily involved. It attempts to help develop union leaders grounded in the principles of the labor movement, and appreciative of the developing relationship between that movement and society in general—to help create the "whole" union member. The ULA, therefore, concentrates upon training staff and local leaders in the theory and practice of trade unionism, applied trade unionism, and labor education methods and techniques.

ULA goals necessarily demand extensive inter-union and inter-university cooperation. Without such cooperation, it would be most difficult, and perhaps impossible, to understand how to apply the academic disciplines to the myriad problems the labor movement is attacking on local, regional, national, and international levels. The growing number of international unions, AFL-CIO departments and universities working within the ULA (six years ago only Rutgers and District 4 of the International Unit of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers were involved) have made possible also selective recruiting, a diversified and more able faculty, and an increasingly adequate financing program.

ULA accomplishments thus far include: 1) training a group of active, competent, and motivated union members who form a reservoir of qualified candidates for local union leadership, staff, and special assignments within the union and in the community; 2) establishment of a framework within which trade union educators can not only do selective recruiting, but can also develop programs which integrate local union level educational work with regional summer schools and national labor education conferences; 3) development of students who, while specifically union-oriented, also are confident, have status, and are broadening their personal horizons; and 4) reduction of the number of university-taught basic labor education courses, and instead, concentration of university efforts on training of union teachers to do that work, and on high-level specialized courses for third and fourth-year ULA students.

Its officers believe that the ULA is significant far more for what it can become than for what it is now. The ULA recognizes the fundamental nature of labor education as jointly-planned, rewarding, and continuing adult education. It also accepts responsibility for helping to educate highly competent union leaders who will necessarily develop firm opinions on broad economic, political, and social issues. The ULA sees continuing adult education and the labor leader with a strong philosophy of his own as complementary, so long as bureaucratic policy and doctrinaire authority take a back seat to intellectual integrity, honest controversy, and fresh thinking.

FULL-TIME STUDY ENCOURAGED BY THE LABOR INTERN PROGRAM

The LIP was developed because Rutgers became convinced that part-time study and practice for labor educators, although both necessary and profitable, is no substitute for a period of full-time experience with developing and maintaining actual programs. The internship program was created to provide this experience. LIP has, since 1956, provided positions on the staff of the Labor Program for periods varying in length from three months to a year, to four mature, experienced trade union leaders. Three have returned to work as labor educators in the labor movement, and one has become a staff member with tenure at the university.

To be accepted for LIP, a candidate must offer: 1) demonstrated leadership ability within the labor movement, 2) possession of elected or appointed union office, and 3) superior accomplishment as a student in leadership training programs conducted at the union-university level.

To qualify for certification, the labor intern must demonstrate, at a minimum, achievement in the following areas: 1) ability to plan and execute relatively long-range labor education programs; 2) ability to prepare adequate course outlines and materials, discussion guides, and conference and summer school manuals and notebooks; 3) ability to teach basic labor courses such as steward training, grievance procedure, labor history, and union administration and, to teach others how to teach; and 4) knowledge of proper use of discussion techniques, role playing and audio-visual materials.

LIP is limited by the fact that it is necessarily expensive. Rutgers can afford to finance only one full-year labor intern every second or third year; few trade unions can afford to give a staff member a year's leave with pay, and finance a replacement at the same time; and promising rank-and-filers have little, if any, chance of securing subsidies from their unions for even a three-month internship. For these reasons, the university is seeking foundation support to finance a five-year experiment with labor internships. Thus far the search has been without success.

CRITERIA CONFIRMED BY EXPERIENCE

Through experience with its "pyramid of service" concept, the Rutgers Institute Labor Program has confirmed the value of several criteria (some we have already stated or implied) as essential to broadened and deepened labor education, combining bread-and-butter subjects, the social sciences, and the humanities.

These criteria are:

1) Labor education must be integrated. A class should relate to a conference, a conference to a subsequent series of classes, a summer school to evaluation of past programs and planning of new ones, and a leadership training program to planning offerings for rank-and-file.

2) Labor education must provide continuity and increasing depth. Programs must be so constructed that they avoid the too common practice of offering the same activity to the same students, year after year, and provide explicitly defined advanced training.

3) Labor education must provide progression. A progressive program is one which permits a union member to learn to become a better steward; and then to go on to learn to become a better executive board member, or a better editor, labor educator, time-study engineer, staff representative; and, also of course, a better citizen.

These three major criteria we have found are complemented by three other criteria. These are:

1. Coordination of broad labor education and specific "vocational" education needs. For example, TUCP students take practical labor economics concurrently with solid courses in economic theory.
2. Coordination of the regular union function with pre-planned educational effort. For example, introduction of instruction on

opposing ideologies into a regularly scheduled political education committee meeting.

3. Coordination of union-university labor education at local, retional and national levels. For example, the Union Leadership Academy, created originally by IUE District 4 in cooperation with Rutgers University, today involves a number of other international unions, the AFL-CIO and other universities.

A most significant conclusion affirmed at Rutgers is that the educational needs of workers are not so very unusual that they should present either peculiar or insurmountable problems. They are, after all, not very different from the educational needs of all adults eager to develop the whole man. It is necessary, however, to make adjustments in curricula, to do some retraining of teachers, to emphasize community orientation, and to be aware of those few differences which do exist between labor and the rest of adult education.

Many new directions in labor education at Rutgers are already clear, hard-earned, and accomplished facts. This achievement is due largely to acceptance within these programs of the principle of true union-university cooperation. Rutgers firmly believes that future, successful, long-range efforts throughout the United States will be built upon this principle of cooperation in labor education. For it is only through understanding jointly arrived at, that the kind of education defined by Everett Dean Martin will be perceived as essential, rather than as "frill," by the usually pragmatic U. S. labor leader.

Russell Allen

National Institute of
Labor Education

RESIDENT STUDY PROGRAM FOR UNION STAFF

The National Institute of Labor Education (NILE) offered its first round of three resident programs in higher education for labor during the summer of 1961. (A second series was held in the summer of 1962.) The ten-week course of study, conducted at three universities, aimed at providing elected or appointed officials of major trade unions with broad knowledge and understanding in basic disciplines. Allen explores in detail the lessons of the first year's experience, analyzing the difficulties as well as the successes, and subjecting the total effort to a conscientiously objective and candid scrutiny.

Russell Allen is Educational Director of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, and Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Residential Study Institutes for NILE.

Liberal education as such is of little interest to the American labor movement. American unions, in contrast to their counterparts in underdeveloped and social-democratic areas of the world, have never regarded it as their function to supply, or to supplement, the general and cultural education of their members. Those few exceptions that do exist must be regarded as ethnic and geographic sports.

Emphasis in labor education has always been on functional matter, related either to job or industry problems, or to clearly relevant political and social extensions of union concerns. This has meant in most instances short-term residential, or part-time non-residential programs. The longest period of the usual residential labor education programs is about one week, generally scheduled during the summer when university facilities are under-utilized.

These characteristics of union education are not surprising, nor do they require apology. They stem from the same set of factors in American political and social history that account for the non-ideological nature of the American union movement itself: early suffrage, free public education, and relatively high social and occupational mobility.

No institution in American society—with the exception possibly of the institution of education itself—really champions liberal education, nor possibly should it be expected to do so.

Yet many in labor education today—and a growing number of union officials—recognize that American society as a whole, and the unions in particular, are faced with unprecedented problems arising from rapid social and economic change both at home and abroad. Domestically, there are the swift technological changes; the changing nature of industry, growing out of mergers and an evolving multi-industrial structure in large corporations; an accelerating alteration in the composition of the labor force; and a sluggishness in economic recovery following each recession.

Internationally, there is competition with the Soviet Union, concurrent with the "revolution of rising expectations" in the emerging countries. These dual factors strain American ability to adapt its social psychology quickly enough to be a force for freedom and economic progress.

If unions are to be more than spectators at the historic scene—indeed, if they are to retain anything like their present level of strength and effectiveness—they must understand these changes and adapt to them. Unions today are lagging, not because the leaders lack training in the specifics of their jobs, but because some union policies, practices, and attitudes are not moving with the current of powerful developments in this country and in the world.

These developments quite obviously arise outside the work-place and cannot be coped with by traditional organizing and collective bargaining methods, nor perhaps by any notions of structure that have yet been evolved. Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly necessary to tap vital springs of new and imaginative leadership, to refresh a stagnating stream.

It was reasoning such as this that led to the presentation of a proposal to the National Institute of Labor Education for an extended (ten week) residential study program for union staff to be held at three major universities. The Fund for Adult Education assisted with a generous grant to NILE to finance part of the cost of the venture for a period of two years.

The curriculum consisted of study in four broad areas from the social sciences and the humanities—economics, political science, sociology, and psychology, and labor history and philosophy—to be supplemented by special seminars, lectures, and discussions on topics of interest and concern to the labor movement.

Though the subject matter was conceived in broad terms, courses were to be approached, not as academic disciplines, but in terms of what labor history and the social sciences could teach about the problems most pertinent to the labor movement today. It was felt also that the different subjects should not be insulated from each other, but should be taught organically, insofar as possible.

While such a program seems a natural enough development for labor education, it was marked immediately as distinctive for five reasons:

1. It was conceived as a joint union-university project.
2. It was long-term, as reckoned by labor education standards.
3. It was residential.
4. It dealt not with tool subjects, nor even with labor relations subjects, but had a broader social science and humanities base.
5. It aimed primarily at full-time union staff.

Other programs—such as the University of Chicago's Union Officers' Program, the Harvard Trade Union Program, and UCLA's Liberal Education for Labor Program—possess some but not all of these characteristics.

The response of the universities was enthusiastic. A number of excellent program plans were submitted, and on the basis of these, the NILE Board chose the three universities to conduct the initial programs. They were the University of California at Berkeley, the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University, and in combination, the University of Michigan, Michigan State, and Wayne State Universities at Michigan State.

A condition of selection had been that the participating university have a year-round labor education program of its own, with a full-time staff, and a labor advisory committee.

A special labor advisory committee was established by NILE for this particular project. And a supplemental grant was obtained from FAE for evaluation—a close study of each of the programs in each of the two years.

Thus, the scene was set to begin work on details of the venture. The first problem was recruitment and selection of participants. First consideration was given to full-time union staff. It was agreed that each applicant must be sponsored by his union, and that both actual and potential leadership qualities would be considered. Above all, every effort was made to avoid the "perennial student," and those with only a thin attachment to their unions.

For a program of this sort, ability to handle reading and writing assignments was an obvious prerequisite. Though no formal academic requirements were set, adequacy in this area was probed through inquiries, and by evaluating a brief essay submitted with the application. No age limits were set down.

Recruitment was conducted through both union and university channels.

Selection was made by a committee composed of an equal number of union and university members, with no acceptances that were not agreeable to the university representatives. Assignment to the different universities was made on the basis of expressed preference where possible, consistent with a fairly even distribution among the three locations.

Total class size was limited to twenty at each university. In actuality, 57 applicants were accepted, of whom 49 completed the course of study. A preliminary analysis of those accepted showed an average age of 43 years, with the modal group in the 35-39 age bracket. The extent of full-time union experience ranged from one year to 19 years, with an average of 9 years. Eight students were part-time local union officers; the rest were full-time union staff.

Each student was awarded a full-tuition scholarship, plus one-half of room and board, if requested. A small number of full subsistence scholarships were made available for special cases. Other costs of the program—payments for lost wages and salaries, travel, and incidental expenses—were borne either by the individual or, as in most cases, by the sponsoring union. Thirty labor organizations were represented among the students in the program.

Some of the special problems a program of this sort is bound to produce, we encountered. What we learned about them is discussed below, to give the reader some notion of the kinds of adaptations from customary approaches that must be made, both by the university and by the union.

Approach to Subject Matter

Mechanics aside, the most difficult aspect of the program was adapting the subject matter and teaching method. Here the union-university partnership was put to its severest test, with mixed results. The relationship obviously had to be more than that of a principal to an independent contractor, with the principal prescribing only the result to be attained, and leaving it to the contractor to devise the means and exercise the controls by which it is to be achieved. Such a relationship reduces the union educators on the advisory committee to the role of an arrangements committee, a menial job, unacceptable, and wasteful of valuable insights and experience.

On the other hand, as every educator knows, any other arrangement touches on tender academic nerves. A proposal, from the advisory committee, for a project director, for instance, was turned down by the NILE Board, on the ground that it might tend to infringe on academic freedom and might "standardize" the approach, at the cost of desirable experimentation.

As it worked out, the universities assumed full responsibility for the selection of teachers, course scheduling, content, texts, and reading materials. They were, however, more than willing to accept counsel on the topics to be covered, special speakers to be invited, and ways to approach subjects.

The accompanying charts show how the three universities allocated classroom time to the major subjects, and what topics were covered in special lectures, seminars, and discussion groups. An examination of the chart shows that diversity was indeed achieved, despite the given "core" curriculum. Inspection of detailed course outlines would reveal even more variety.

		I. MAIN COURSES				II. SPECIAL COURSES		
		ECONOMICS	POLITICAL SCIENCE	SOCIOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY	LABOR MOVEMENT	READING	WRITING	RESEARCH
CALIFORNIA	Number of Units	20	20	20	20	18	10	14
	Time per Unit	90 min.	90 min.	90 min.	90 min.	1 hr.	1 hr.	1 hr.
CORNELL	Number of Units	19	19	19	19	8	-	-
	Time per Unit	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	2 hrs.	1-1/4 hrs.	-	-
MICHIGAN STATE	Number of Units	22	22	26 (Soc-20, Psy-6)	21	7	-	-
	Time per Unit	80 min.	80 min.	80 min.	80 min.	80 min.	-	-

III. ALL DAY LONG DISCUSSIONS; SEMINARS	IV. SPECIAL TOPICS
Seven seminars, each lasting three hours, were held on the following subjects: Discussion Methods Occupational Frontiers of Trade Unionism Social Psychology Unconventional Warfare Problems of Underdeveloped Nations The Competence of Free Men Union Democracy and Public Review One week-end seminar was held at the Marine Cooks and Stewards Training School, Santa Rosa	Twice a week, two-hour evening sessions were held. Topics were: U.S. Foreign Policy . . . Technology and Institutions . . .World Peace and the Arms Race . . . Industrial Relations in the USSR . . . Pre-paid Health Plans . . . Moonlighting and Automation . . . Farm Labor Problems . . . Communist China and the UN . . . Arbitration . . . International Conflict . . . The Economics of Full Employment . . . International Trade . . . NILE . . . Unions and the Legislature . . . The Soviet Image of America . . . Workmen's Compensation . . . The Norwegian Labor Movement . . . Social Planning and Trade Unions.
Five all-day seminars each lasting 5-1/2 hours were held on the following subjects: Technological Change and the Displaced Worker The Exploding Metropolis International Trade Frontiers of Union Organization Health Insurance A five-day seminar was held on: Governments Public and Private: The Regulation of Union Activities	Fourteen two-hour evening sessions were held. Topics were: Use of Library Facilities . . . Science and Technology . . . Big Business and American Industry . . . The Role of the Manager in Society . . . Problems of Public Education . . . A New Look? Management Approaches to Collective Bargaining . . . Labor Relations in Government Employment . . . The Soviet Economy . . . United States Foreign Policy . . . American Labor and the International Labor Movement . . . What the Critics Are Saying about Labor . . . The Civil Rights Crisis . . . Labor's Economic Program . . . A New Philosophy for Labor.
Three lecture-discussion programs were held, each one taking a full day, on the following subjects: Technology and Society Organization and Men The U.S. and the World Community. Four seminars were held, each one lasting one class period (80 minutes), for the purpose of discussing the program. One weekend session, plus 5 80-minute periods during the week, were devoted to: Art and Society.	The following special topics were presented at various times—within the regular class day (9 to 3), at evening sessions, or on weekends. Subjects covered in two units (80 min. per unit): Civil Liberties . . . The American Conservative . . . Issues between Craft and Industrial Unions. Three-unit sessions were held on: Democracy and Education . . . The American Novel . . . Social Security . . . Measuring Public Opinion.

An instance of an experimental approach, not revealed by the chart, was Michigan State's use of three major day-long lecture-discussions, as a basis for extensive exploration of the subjects in classes. The topics, spaced three weeks apart, were, in order: Technology and Society, Organization and Men, and the United-States and the World Community. The chief purpose of this approach was to make certain that the facts and background of a subject were fully understood before they were discussed from the varying perspectives of the teachers.

Cornell used the fifth and tenth weeks for "integrating" what had been learned in the earlier periods. The fifth week was devoted to government regulation of private organizations, and the tenth week to the "welfare state."

California and Cornell taught two of the subjects during the first five weeks and the other two during the second five. Michigan State taught all courses throughout, with less emphasis in the early stages on labor history.

Transformation Required in Teachers' Thinking

In a program such as this, we learned, it is essential that the teacher completely transform his usual way of approaching his subject. His concern should be not with how the economist, or sociologist, or political scientist looks at the subject, but with how the union representative looks at it, and how it can be brought into his ken. On the other hand, however, the instructor must also make the student aware of the approach of the economist, or sociologist, or political scientist to problems, and the contribution made by his particular discipline. The students are actually very much interested in such matters, and it would be cheating them not to give them something of the "feel" of each discipline.

The teacher in this situation has also another problem—the need to adjust to students who are adult, who bring to the classroom much experience, and long-held opinions. These must be taken into account—to be used, but not permitted to dominate. With the trade unionist adult, there is in addition an overlay of institutional attachments and commitments, not to just an institution but to that institution which (apart from minority groups) is the major "out-group" in American culture. The average union representative feels himself, and often he is, beset by a hostile environment, and a chorus of critics of whom only a handful are friendly. His response to criticism, therefore, tends to be sensitive and defensive, almost to the point of mild paranoia in some cases. Yet the same person who reacts most strongly to criticism from an "outsider" might himself voice the same kind of criticism within his own union.

The teacher must be aware of this psychology, if he is to avoid setting up barriers of emotion which will block anything he is trying to get across. This is not to say that subjects should not be examined critically; they must be if the program is to fulfill its function and its special promise. But the way in which the individual is brought to examine the subject is crucial in determining whether or not any learning will take place. Conversely, the students must be made aware of their obligation to accept the good faith of the teacher. They must understand that no subject is being put before them casually, and without a great deal of forethought; every topic carefully scrutinized, not only as to its relevance to the union movement, but also as to its importance to the union as a democratic institution in a free society. And the university ought to be willing to operate on the premise that its primary purpose is to produce better, more effective union leaders. It accepts the same kind of aim, without hesitation, in respect to its educational programs for farmers, businessmen, and technologists of all kinds. If this approach means that the program becomes something less than truly liberal, the university has ample precedent to justify it. No institution will cooperate in a program, if it sees the results as possibly debilitating to its staff's morale and its ability to function.

Another necessary adaptation is a greater concern for pedagogy. Unfortunately, concern for good teaching has become associated in the minds of academicians with "watering-down," lack of care for subject matter, loss of depth, etc. Such fears have reached ridiculous proportions, so that some seem to believe that the height of proper teaching form is to be totally unconcerned with how and whether students learn.

As we indicated above, adult unionists come to this type of program with a natural pragmatic bent. They are not here for liberal education as such. This, they believe, they can get at university extension courses in their own communities, and with much less strain. They want to learn, in our kind of program, what the social sciences and humanities can teach them to make them better union leaders.

For this reason, the teacher must wrench himself out of his normal grooves. He needs to discard his usual course outlines and lecture notes, or at least to set them aside until he has completely reconstructed the course, built, not around his major concerns, nor those of his colleagues, but around the major concerns of his students. He is dealing with students whose reading skills are often rusty, both in speed and comprehension. In fact, a sizable number of his students will learn very little in the usual ways.

The teacher must choose problems, cases, and questionnaires, and build readings around these. He must move from the specific and familiar to the general and theoretical, not vice versa. He must strip his vocabulary of jargon, or at any rate bring it in for the sake of shorthand reference, easily and naturally only after he has explained, in simple terms, what the concept means. He must slim down the usual buxom reading list to the spare necessities, and then give his students time to see the connection between what they have read and their own world. He must always refer in class to virtually every scrap of reading that he has assigned.

Those students who are ready to learn in a form closer to the academic pattern can be encouraged to take tutorial sessions with the instructors. But the pattern of teaching based on lecture and reading, whatever its merits for undergraduate and graduate teaching, must be in this situation heavily supplemented by methods that demand participation and provide continuing opportunity to gauge comprehension and progress.

Failure, in a few instances, to observe these canons at our institutes resulted in teaching that with this group was either uninteresting, or ineffective, even though by college standards, it may have been on a high level of competence.

There are adaptations that must be made on the union side as well. First and foremost, the unions must understand that the requirements of the program are such that not everybody can be accepted. This means that unions, and especially the education directors who do the recruiting, must not accept applications from those who, although available, are not up to the course of study; and when such applications are turned down, unions must accept the fact that the rejections were not made without good reason. The customary equalitarianism must give way, in this instance, to appropriate standards. Not to apply such standards in a program of this type is actually irresponsible.

Some errors in recruitment, as might be expected, did occur. One person dropped out because the program was not as vocational as he had expected it to be. A few others worked at less than their capacity, because they regarded the program more or less as an assignment from their union, rather than as an opportunity which they eagerly sought for themselves. Efforts are being made to revise recruitment procedure in the second round, to avoid such recurrences.

The Evaluation Program

An evaluation program was set up under the direction of Professor Goodwin Watson of Teachers College, Columbia University. Three evaluators worked under his tutelage, one at each of the three universities. They were present at all sessions, and kept full records on what was done, the readings assigned, the materials used, and so forth. They conducted interviews and tests, before and after the programs, and worked with both faculty and students throughout. A preliminary evaluation report has been prepared on the first year's program, and although it would be premature at this point to quote from it in detail, a few of the broad conclusions can certainly be mentioned here.

The evaluation committee recommended first, that added emphasis in the next program be put on selective and broad recruiting, in the hope of getting many more applicants than there are places to fill. Secondly, it recommended that the teachers take all possible steps to eliminate passivity on the part of students, and to get a maximum of "feedback."

In a related activity, the labor advisory committee, in order to help identify more specifically the problem and policy areas most in need of attention, has set up committees composed of union staff working in research and education, to draft detailed working papers for the consideration of the university teachers. These will be taken into account in shaping the course content of the second year's program.

The value of this evaluation program is that it is as disinterested as it is possible to make it. Too often evaluations achieve a low level of candor, even when stripped of the conventional courtesy. Many are made by persons directly or indirectly responsible for the program they are evaluating. What father will speak ill of his own children? Whatever other shortcomings this evaluation may have, it will not be a self-serving report.

The Program in Perspective

It is easy to get so caught up with the difficulties of a program, however, that one loses perspective. The usual testimonials from the students could be provided, but self-congratulation would serve no purpose here. More important are some of the tangible results already in evidence. One full-time representative has been assigned to work as a regional education representative for his union; another is working on a voluntary basis (in addition to his full-time union job) as a regional education staff man. A third has been hired by the union's national office as a staff editor. Another has moved into higher elective office, a move which he attributes (perhaps too generously) to this residential experience. Not to claim too much, it seems that at least some of the credit for these developments must go to the boost provided by the NILE program; and it is reasonably certain that the performance of these individuals in their new jobs will be conditioned by this experience.

In being candid about problems, therefore, we do not want to leave the impression that the venture was not eminently worthwhile and in a large measure successful. For one thing, the program is unique; and though it has to have more than novelty to recommend it, it is striving to fill a serious void in labor education.

That the universities themselves recognize this gap in their offerings is indicated by the enthusiastic response and the hard work that they put into it. Students aside, the real heroes of the program were the administrators—Fred Hoehler of Michigan State, John Hutchinson of Berkeley, and Ron Donovan of Cornell—who labored mightily on its behalf, at some cost to their life expectancies.

President John Hannah of Michigan State University put the attitude of the universities well when he stated that Michigan State's labor program service was set up "to make available to labor groups the total resources of the university" as they had been made available in the past to agricultural and other groups.

Certainly no program that fails to come close to the resident study program's course content, in whatever form it is presented, can claim to be making available "the total resources of the university" to the labor movement.

When one remembers the very special conditions that must exist for true liberal education to flourish, and how rarely such conditions are found even at our institutions of higher education, one should not blush at falling short of total success. Approaches to liberal education for labor will have much more influence if those responsible confront the limitations candidly, and take them rigorously into account in all programs designed to serve labor.

Our whole society, as well as the union movement, has an important stake in the success of programs such as this one. As John Hutchinson of the University of California wrote:

> "It is not simply a matter of more effective bargaining and organizing. It is also a matter of the preservation of the free society. Trade unionism is not simply an instrument for economic reward and industrial due process. It is an agency of protest, a guarantor of dissent.
>
> "A free, strong, and vociferous labor movement, indeed, may be not only a test but a condition of the free society. It is hardly a coincidence that those modern societies we call free are all characterized by strong and socially-conscious labor movements, or that free trade unions are among the first victims of the authoritarians.
>
> "The decline of the American labor movement to a point where it could no longer serve as a balance-wheel in the power structure of the community would be a calamity, not only for trade unionists, but for all citizens."

The problem, then, is to bridge the chasm; to see if both unions and universities can bend to a program that is long enough to be both intensive and broad, that is liberal in content and method, that is free of jargon though not of concepts, and that requires an enormous amount of hard work on the part of both students and teachers.

There are factors at work in both unions and universities that militate against such experiments. Nevertheless, they should be undertaken, for the gap between unions and universities is widening rather than closing. For the universities, the stake is communication with an important stratum in the national life; for the unions, it is a chance to renew their strength and break out of stifling institutionalism.

John Mc Collum

University of Chicago

UNION LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

A two-year, non-residential, course of study for union officers, the Union Leadership Program of the University of Chicago, is one of the most ambitious forms of liberal education programs today available to unions. McCollum's account in the article that follows reveals a program broad in scope, sophisticated in content, and imaginative in the adaptation of methodology.

The program was initiated in 1959, under a grant from the Fund for Adult Education, and is the major enterprise of the Union Research and Education Projects (UREP), which conducts also a number of other labor education programs, research studies, short conferences, institutes, etc., as well as developing the instructional materials for use in labor education programs.

John McCollum was Director of the Union Research and Education Projects when the Union Leadership Program was developed, working with it until he left the University of Chicago in March, 1962.

The Union Leadership Program[1] is a two year course for Chicago area trade union leaders. It meets for two weekly sessions, each three hours long, to study in broad categories of subject matter: the social sciences; collective bargaining; labor history, and theories and philosophies of the labor movement; the humanities; the natural sciences; and logic; and, study skills and reading comprehension.

---

[1] This report is more than the product of the author noted. Many of the conclusions and ideas presented here come whole or in part from publications of The University of Chicago's Union Research and Education Projects and were written by the author and his former colleagues, particularly Margaret Blough, the late Frank London Brown, and Thomas Cosgrove. I refer especially to these publications: A Liberal Arts Curriculum for Trade Union Officers, June, 1958. The First Annual Report: The Union Leadership Program, September, 1960. Peter Senn, Liberal Education for Trade Union Leaders, December, 1958. All are Union Research and Education Project publications.

This report discusses the origin and development of the program, its general aims and purposes, the curriculum, methods of recruiting and selecting participants, and some of the implications to be inferred from the experience so far.

Genesis and Growth

In 1949, the University of Chicago offered its first program for union officers—a six month, non-residential course, oriented around collective bargaining and union leadership training. The program had two major goals: to provide a comprehensive educational experience for unionists, and to serve as a laboratory where materials, ideas, methods, approaches and curriculum could be subjected to classroom experimentation.[2]

Thus, over the years, the Union Officers Program was constantly being revised—in terms of length of time and the quality of the curriculum. By 1951, it was meeting in weekly three-hour sessions for a full academic year, and moving gradually in subject matter toward the social sciences.

An Advanced Union Officers Program was added in 1954, another full year of study, focused primarily on the social sciences and the humanities.

In spite of continued revision, however, or perhaps because of it, it soon became apparent that the program lacked essential coherence. Especially after the advanced program had been added, as a kind of overlay on the first year program, it looked like a mere collection of courses —sometimes overlapping and often unrelated to each other. A request was made to the Ford Foundation[3] for a grant to make possible a total reconstruction of the program, as well as to extend its scope. This grant, awarded in 1958, was used to develop the Union Leadership Program, which is the subject of this report. Launched in the autumn of 1959, it graduated its first class in June of 1961, and is now half way through the second cycle.

---

[2] The prime mover behind the Union Officers Program and responsible for its development was A. A. Liveright.

[3] A variety of proposals were submitted. Perhaps the most definitive was University Level Liberal Education for Trade Union Leaders, The Union Research and Education Projects, January, 1958.

Aims and Objectives

The Union Leadership Program deals essentially with the problem of the unionist as an individual in a free society. Its purpose is to help students to understand the forces directly affecting them, and to learn how to cope with these forces.

It is obvious that the labor movement (embracing some 45 million workers and their families, and representing nearly every racial, occupational, regional, and age group in the society) has within it the potential for providing a primary impetus for the development of a truly liberal, dynamic democracy. It has a highly important role to play in the achievement of those basic ends that concern the society as a whole: the crystallization of the fundamental goals of our nation, the development of a truly democratic leadership, and the maintenance of a free society. The intellectual breadth and awareness of the vanguard of labor leadership is then an important concern of the university, and the Union Leadership Program is directed toward the achievement of such ends.

Basing itself on what had been learned from experience with the Union Officers Program, the Union Leadership Program started with the following assumptions.[4]

1) Any deficiency in educational background of students would be compensated for by their strong motivation to become more effective as trade unionists, with educational achievement seen as a means toward this end. This motivation, added to the wide life-experience students would bring to the classroom, would make it possible for them to cope with college level work.

2) Most of the students would come from, what Hoggart calls, "the earnest miniority";[5] they would be highly motivated working people, who would find in the program a major outlet for their intellectual and edu-

---

[4] See: The Advanced Union Officers Program: An Evaluation of Experiment in Liberal Labor Education, The Union Research and Education Projects, August, 1957.

[5] Richard Hoggart, The Uses of Literacy (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1958), pp. 241-263.

cational aspirations. And since most of the students would be participating on their own time, and making some personal investment in the program (purchase of books, accommodation of personal and social life, etc.) it could be expected that they would be ready to make a vigorous intellectual effort, with commitment increasing as the program progressed.

3) Since the students would come already relatively experienced and competent in trade union skills, their attention could be focused on developing and nurturing their interest in broad liberal subjects.

And finally, labor unions could be expected to encourage members to engage in this kind of education effort. The American labor unions are in the midst of fundamental changes in character, nature, and goals. They must cope with such critical problems as, for example, survival in the face of declining membership, collective bargaining in the context of automation, new civic and community responsibilities of leaders and members, the international crisis, etc. If unions are to play a viable role in the society, a great deal will hinge on the intellectual breadth and awareness of the vanguard of union leadership. Among these are the second level of union officialdom toward whom the Union Leadership Program is directed.

Several guiding principles were formulated to underpin the program design:

1. Subjects should be chosen and taught so as to inculcate in students a sense of curiosity and a desire for continuing education after they complete this program.

2. As a result of participation, students should come to feel, not only that doors were being opened for them, but that habits and patterns were being changed—that the ideas and knowledge to which they were exposed would be of lasting value, usefulness, and interest.

3. In terms of Mannheim's notion of "total conception,"[6] the program should aim not only to locate the students in present roles and situations, but to drive toward identification with the broader society.

4. The program should aim not at developing specialists, but rather

---

[6] Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (New York: Harvest Books, 1936), p. 107.

generalists, knowledgeable, and articulate, and familiar with the major questions in the arts and sciences—"the accepted truths, the disputed problems, the rival schools, and the methods now in favor."[7]

Specifically, in terms of curriculum, the broad objectives as they are articulated today are: (1) to provide an understanding of the broad social, political, and economic traditions of American society, (2) to develop an appreciation of the sciences and humanities as aids in understanding one's self and one's society, and (3) to provide an understanding of the over-all drift of American society: where it is going and the alternative courses of action that are available.

Study in technical, vocational or skill subjects is considered appropriate for this program only if it can serve to increase competence in handling the regular subject matter. Consequently, courses in "grievance procedure" for example, are not included in the program; reading comprehension and logic courses are. (While these latter courses are included mainly to help achieve program objectives, they may also serve, it is felt, to increase the unionist's competence with respect to basic union management skills.)

The Students

Recruiting

Each year, the goal is to recruit fifty students for two sections of the first year of the program. Recruiting is carried on in cooperation with local and national union officials. The Chicago area Labor Federations have mailed program literature to affiliated unions, and in some cases also official statements of their own supporting the program. The UREP's Labor Advisory Committee of some 20 members, in addition to helping in the development of the program and teaching in it, also helps to find students for the program.

The staff of UREP goes to union meetings and conventions, makes telephone calls, and probes any other avenue that might prove productive. In addition, many former students have voluntarily devoted a great deal of their own time to finding promising students. (UREP has an alumni of over 300 Chicago area trade unionists from the various Union Officers Programs, and, at one time, there was even an alumni association in existence.)

---

[7] For a statement of this approach see, Jacques Barzun, The House of Intellect (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 12.

Finding promising students is a difficult task. Even though there is a huge union membership in the Chicago area (one of the major reasons for the program's success), recruiting continues to be one of the most challenging phases of the program.

A successful recruiting effort for the two first-year sections will result in the registration of about sixty students, of which ten can be expected to drop out even before the program begins. Various reasons are given for this early withdrawal: conflicting work schedules, lack of interest, unwillingness of the union to pay tuition, lack of capacity, etc.

Characteristics of the Students

Occupation and union affiliation: Of the 29 students who completed the first year program, eight were full-time union officers; the rest were in a variety of occupations, for the most part semi-skilled or unskilled in nature. They came from seventeen different International Unions, five industrial and twelve craft unions. Most of them held some kind of union office. Four were local union presidents, five were secretary-treasurers, four were executive board members, four others were full time union organizers, two were business agents, and two were stewards. Only seven were rank and file members.

Formal education: Two were college graduates; one had not completed grammar school. Only seven had gone beyond high school; the rest were about equally divided between those who left after the second year of high school, and those who stayed to graduate.

Ability level: The students were given three standardized educational tests. The ACE (Psychological Examination for College Freshman, 1946 edition) produced percentile scores ranging from 92 to -1; the California Reading Test, revealed reading grade placement levels as ranging from 9.3 to 15.2. The ACE Reading Comprehension percentile rank was spread from 97 to 3.

According to norms compiled by University College of the University of Chicago, students who rank above the 30th percentile in ACE scores prove capable of doing average or above average work in college: seven in the Union Leadership Program's first graduating class were in this category. Like students in most other adult education programs, these students tend to cluster at the two extremes of the ability continuum with respect to reading skill, and in general intellectual ability to handle college level material. The average ACE Percentile scores for this group was 33.4, corresponding quite closely to scores of average "pre-professional" students in formal adult education programs.

Age, Sex: Ages range from the early 20's to the mid-50's, with about two-thirds of the students somewhere between 25 and 35 years old. About 15% of the students are women—a typical class of 25 will include three or four women. Over the years, the proportion of Negro students appears to be gradually increasing; today, it comes to about 30%.

Attendance and Drop-Outs

Experience indicates that of about 50 students who start the first year, as many as 10 or 12 will probably leave the program in the first academic quarter, and 4 or 5 in the second quarter. Enrollment tends to stabilize during the third quarter. In the summer months, however, between academic years, another two or three students are likely to withdraw. Thus, in the past, a first year group of 50 provided a second year group of 25 to 30 students.

Reasons given for dropping out of the program are varied. Those who drop out early tend to stress such things as dissatisfaction with the program, inability to handle the materials; etc. Those who leave later tend to do so for compelling personal, union, or occupational reasons.

Most students find it a real hardship to attend classes regularly. Union meetings, work conflicts, inclement weather, commuting problems —all combine to make it difficult for the unionists to get to the two three-hour sessions each week.

The staff makes a vigorous effort, however, to keep attendance regular. Chronic absentees are asked to withdraw. Of the rest, a very few, one or two in each class, will attend all sessions; the majority attends about 50 of the 70 sessions during the year. Average attendance at individual sessions is about 20 of the 25 enrolled students.

The Program

The Courses

Eight basic courses form the framework for the first year of the program. They are:

1. Union Leadership and Social Forces: Draws on sociology, anthropology and psychology, and focuses on the theories of human nature, personality development, and collective behavior. Union leadership is used as a base in evaluating the various theories, and for comparative purposes in studying such ideas as child behavior, behavior in stress situations, etc. (About 24 classroom hours.)
2. Study Skills and Reading Comprehension: Instruction in reading, comprehension, note-taking, logic, and writing. (About 24 classroom hours.)
3. Economics: Concepts and systems; the role of the corporation, the government, and the labor union in the economy. (About 24 classroom hours.)
4. Collective Bargaining: The nature, extent, and scope of collective bargaining in the United States; comparison with selected foreign countries. (About 24 classroom hours.)
5. Theories and Philosophies of the Labor Movement: Major theories that have been developed to interpret the nature and significance of the American labor movement. (About 24 classroom hours.)
6. The Visual Arts: Understanding and appreciation of the visual arts, and of the major forms and techniques. (About 24 classroom hours.)
7. The Natural Sciences: Nature, methods, concepts, and role of the sciences in contemporary society. (About 30 classroom hours.)
8. Theories of Society: Social theory, social organization, and collective behavior. (About 21 classroom hours.)

Ten classroom hours are devoted to tests and evaluations.

The second year offers ten basic courses:

1. Urbanism and Social Change: Major theories of social change, with an attempt to link them to the concept of urbanism generally, and the Chicago area specifically. (About 24 classroom hours.)
2. Political Power and Control: Consideration of political theories, concepts of organization, administration, power, freedom, authority, leadership, etc., and when appropriate, application to unions, government, and other organizations. (About 24 classroom hours.)
3. Issues in an Industrial Society: A loosely defined course designed to focus on current issues and problems such as the meaning of work, the social impact of automation, the individual and the organization, etc. (About 15 classroom hours.)
4. Ethical and Political Philosophies: Major philosophical schools of thought and the application to leadership and the individual in contemporary society. (About 18 classroom hours.)
5. American History: The social and economic development of American society. (About 27 classroom hours.)

6. Labor Law: History, development, and broad principles of Labor Law. (About 24 classroom hours.)
7. American Literature: A representative study of contemporary and classical American literature. (About 24 classroom hours.)
8. Music: Similar in aims and objectives to the art course offered the first year; general music appreciation with emphasis placed on understanding different forms and kinds of music. (About 24 classroom hours.)
9. Study Skills and Reading Comprehension: Similar to course offered the first year. (About 21 classroom hours.)
10. Thesis Seminar, Program Summary and Conclusion: The final portion of the program is devoted to an over-all summary and evaluation of the program and individual work with each student in the preparation of the students' final reports. (About 21 classroom hours.)

As in the first year, ten classroom hours are devoted to testing.

To avoid a complete break during the summer months, between academic years, three or four special evening seminars are scheduled. Several weeks in advance, students are assigned a book to read (Lippmann's Public Philosophy, for example), and the evening is devoted to a discussion of the book.

The Faculty

During the early stages of the program, staff members, in order to evaluate and to make adjustments, taught most of the courses themselves. Currently, regular university faculty members, as well as the staff and Chicago area union officials, teach in the program.

Notes on Method

A chief method that has been used is discussion, based primarily on materials developed by Union Research and Education Projects for earlier programs; some preparation for these discussions, including reading of assigned materials, was required. In addition, a large part of the factual material discussed was drawn, wherever possible, from the students' experience.

Considerable attention has been given to the development of study skills. The aim was to improve the student's ability to understand what he reads and to think critically about the new ideas and information acquired by reading. Wherever possible practice materials were the readings assigned in the regular courses. Increasing the speed of reading was not a primary objective, although some gains were made here, too.

The natural sciences were handled through tutorials, a line-by-line reading of some mathematics and physics texts in the classroom, and through lectures. When astronomy was chosen as the major example of mathematical physics, it was possible to make use also of the facilities of the Adler Planetarium.

The visual arts were studied through tutorials devoted to analysis of works of art brought to the classroom and viewed at the Chicago Art Institute.

Program Evaluation and Examinations

A major weakness in the over-all program is the inadequate scheme for evaluation. Resources have not been available for more than the quarterly examinations, and the evaluation made subjectively by students in questionnaires and interviews.

The quarterly examinations: At the end of each academic quarter students are asked to write responses to a set of comprehensive questions concerning the quarter's work. The questions are designed to review the quarter's work, integrate the material presented, and apply the knowledge learned to concrete situations and problems.[8] A class period is devoted to a discussion of how the students might answer the questions, sources to consult, lines of thought that might be explored, etc. The students are then given about two weeks to complete their examinations and to submit them to the staff for evaluation.

Student evaluation of the program: Two questionnaires have been designed to elicit the students' own reactions to the program. One questionnaire is of conventional multiple choice design; the other is a "projective" sentence-completion type. Some conclusions drawn from responses to these questionnaires follow:

1. With few exceptions, students feel the reading selections and assignments are within their grasp, and stimulating as exercises. The volume of reading is generally thought to be some-

---

[8] The questions are of the general "essay" type. A typical one is: "There are two general ways of explaining how people get their attitudes, opinions, beliefs and behavior patterns. One explanation is that these things come from a person's personal thinking and assessment of situations. The other is that they come from the relevant groups to which people belong. What do these theories tell us about membership identification with the union?"

what on the "heavy" side—about three-fifths of the students say it is too much, and two-fifths say it is "just right."

2. Reading time spent per week ranges from 30 minutes to about 12 hours, with the mean time spent about 4 hours.
3. Practically all the students discuss the program with fellow union members. They attempt to convey a positive concept of the program, thus reflecting, it is assumed, their own positive identification. As communicated to other unionists, the rationale for participating in the program is formulated mainly in terms of practical "union value." This may be a function of the audience being addressed, since students frequently also, in other situations, refer to the broad scope of the program, and its value beyond union affairs.
4. A large number of the students share their educational experience witn their spouses and non-union-connected friends.
5. Participation in the program appears to contribute to a reduction of ambivalence toward education in general. It also seems that continued involvement makes for greater appreciation of the programs' broader aspects and values.
6. Apparently the program has been a personally rewarding experience for virtually all the students. Students refer to an enlargement of personal perspectives, increased interest in new ideas, changes in reading habits, etc.
7. The most difficult problem seems to be finding the time for reading and study.
8. The three courses which received the largest number of negative comments are those dealing directly with union affairs. In part, this may be because these courses were "too general" or "theoretical" to appear to be of any practical value. However, it is encouraging that few negative comments are directed toward those courses dealing not at all, or less directly, with union affairs—art, social science, etc.

Implication of the Program

The Union Leadership Program is still a new and inadequately understood venture. Only one cycle has been entirely completed. Thus any attempt to draw conclusions and assess the program must be general and somewhat superficial. In this context, some conclusions follow:

1. There is good reason to believe that this kind of program can be an on-going venture. Before it was launched, considerable scepticism existed about the program's chances of success. A common conclusion was that it would not work, unionists would not enroll in a two year program, would not tolerate heavy doses of the sciences and the humanities, would not attend classes two evenings a week, etc. Experience so far seems to deny these negative predictions.
2. The Union Leadership Program has stimulated the development of liberal labor education. Several examples: The Communica-

tion Workers of America, in the winter of 1959, asked the University to develop a week long institute for all the top officers and staff representatives of the union—some 180 persons. The Conference stressed the social sciences and the humanities in understanding the changing and emerging American society.[9] Also, in 1959 a similar conference was conducted for 32 statewide political action directors of the United Steelworkers of America. Still another unusual venture was a residential training program for new staff representatives of the Communication Workers of America[10]—a six month program held in 1961-1962, for 12 new staff appointees. The students spent two months on the campus of the University in a program stressing the social sciences. This residential portion of the program was integrated with field work in the union and a union conducted training program in Washington, D. C.

3. A number of foreign unionists and adult educators have visited the Union Leadership Program. One unionist from Africa graduated with the first class. Considerable interest has been expressed in starting similar programs in Africa, Latin America, and India.
4. Within the limitations of the Union Research and Education Projects an ambitious testing and evaluation program has been started, a much needed service in labor education as a whole.
5. Materials and ideas growing out of the Union Leadership Program have been used in other education programs. The University of Kansas, for example, is using program materials in its labor education work, and another university is using the basic curriculum and some of the syllabi in a broad undergraduate course in its business school. These syllabi[11] are being used also in several other situations.
6. The Union Leadership Program continues to be an experimental effort. The curriculum is constantly under revision and new ideas are always under consideration. For example, it is quite possible that in the near future, the program may be expanded to a three or even a four year venture, or classroom time may be extended some other way.
7. The Program has had an impact on the intellectual and career development of some of the students. Several have been appointed to union staff positions; other have been promoted; and at least one has been appointed to a special post in government. Most of the students provide moving examples of how the program has affected their lives.
8. Within the University of Chicago the Program has stimulated

---

[9] Margaret Blough, Evaluation Report of the Communication Workers of America Staff Conference, Union Research and Education Projects, February, 1961.

[10] Joseph A. Beirne, "Unionists Must Prepare for a Different Future," Adult Leadership, Volume 10, Number 7 (January, 1962), p. 195.

[11] Syllabi currently available are: "Union Leadership and Social Forces," "Collective Bargaining," and "Urbanism and Social Change."

greater interest in liberal adult education. Discussions are under way concerning the possibilities of developing other kinds of liberal education programs; *e.g.*, liberal education programs for workers as workers, short programs for top unionists, development of paperback libraries, etc.

Conclusions

To claim that the program is a total success would be to claim too much. It works, and works reasonably well, but there are many difficulties. For the university, it is an expensive venture: it requires considerable staff time and resources (the original grant to develop the program proved to be insufficient). For the unions, the cost may seem high —$300 per year, per student. Estimated on a classroom hour basis, however, it is relatively cheap, but even though this tuition fee covers only a small portion of the cost, it is not an easy task to collect tuition.

As compared to labor education in the United States, the program seems to be outstanding, but when compared to efforts in Europe, especially in terms of content level and length, the Union Leadership Program is not spectacular.

The curriculum, degree of subject matter integration, the development of syllabi, and the testing program are major areas that require much further study. Perhaps the greatest value of the program is that it works surprisingly well—in spite of the relatively small investment put into it. This fact will tend to counteract the general skepticism about the feasibility of such programs, and encourage, over the long run, foundations, universities, and unions to venture into such new areas, and to support other seemingly odd and uncertain programs.

PROGRAMS IN OTHER CONTEXTS

Hy Kornbluh

The most significant development in liberal education for unionists outside the university, says Kornbluh epigrammatically, is an increasing demand by unions for liberal education for union leaders from the university. This is not to imply, however, that unions are not themselves now conducting programs that are "liberalizing." The major portion of Kornbluh's essay is devoted to the vivid description and incisive analysis of programs, sponsored by unions, that have extended their curricula to include broad subject matter and "liberalizing" methodology. It is because liberal study is coming to be recognized as an essential part of the training of staff, he says, that the increasing cooperation of the universities is now both a practical and an academic necessity.

Hy Kornbluh is Director of the Division of Labor Education and Services of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at the University of Michigan-Wayne State University. He has had long and varied experience as a labor educator, working for, among others, the United Packinghouse Workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and the national CIO Department of Research and Education.

SURVEY OF NON-UNIVERSITY CONNECTED LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR TRADE UNIONISTS

Joseph Mire in his report "Labor Education," conducted on behalf of the Inter-University Labor Education Committee, quoted statements on a definition and objectives of adult "liberal" education. The essentials of his quotations define "liberal" education as ". . . education for the rights and responsibilities of freedom, personal and social . . . concerned with the continuing development of each individual . . . in the creation of an increasingly democratic society. . . . (It) cannot be determined by looking at form or content. . . . What is important is direction. Education, usually moved forward as a result not of occasional impacts, however powerful, but of continuing process. . . . Continuing relationships with systematically guided activities are desirable."

As to objectives, (liberal education) ". . . must constantly aim . . . at effective thinking, communication, the making of relevant judgments, and the discrimination of values. . . . (But) learning . . . will be of little use to the student unless he can relate his learning to the realities of experience and practice."[1]

Education Directors' Views of Liberal Education in Their Programs

Union labor educators have what at first glance appears to be differing views on whether their own programs constitute liberal education. Most of those who have thought about it and who are conducting significant union education programs would indicate that their own programs are "liberalizing" rather than liberal education in the strict sense of the term. Supporting this view, one education director says, "Too narrow an approach that does not give even the context of a problem is not even good occupational training."

At one apparent extreme of the discussion are the union education directors who feel that any serious attempt at education is "liberal" education, and therefore their own and many other union education programs are "liberal" education. Further discussion with this group usually places them in the camp with the above-mentioned "liberalizers." At the other extreme are a few who feel their programs contain no elements of liberal education. Although they do not consciously think in terms of liberalizing education, some of these education directors will, nevertheless, seek out teachers for their programs to teach collective bargaining, for example, within the context of the economics of their industry and the nation. One former director of a major union education program, however, insisted while in that job that his own program, as well as most other union programs, were not "education," but rather training and indoctrination. Few, if any, union education people, would completely agree with this view.

---

[1] Labor Education, A study report on needs, programs, and approaches. Joseph Mire. Inter-University Labor Education Committee, 1956, pp. 12-13. The reports he quotes from are a report to the Fund for Adult Education by the Development Committee on Internships, Scholarships, and Fellowships in 1953 and the report of the Harvard University Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society in 1945.

Union education programs and the administrators of these programs of necessity operate within the limitations set by the day to day needs of the union, the policies of elected union officials, and the ability and/or willingness of the union to devote substantial financial resources to such programs. Because of this, there has been no union program which has attempted to provide a systematic educational experience over a long-term period. As a result, many union educationists have made out a case for the universities, particularly those publicly financed, taking a major share of the responsibility in providing education that meets the criteria of "continuing process" for trade unionists. Federal government financing of labor education including such programs has been needed for a number of years.

Nevertheless, programs outside the universities have shown some trends toward further "liberalizing"—expanding upon basic or "tool" subjects, and programming advanced courses for those who have attended an initial program. Rogin* referred to "advanced one-week institutes." These are planned as follow-up schools to a week at a "basic" institute. Examples are the summer institutes sponsored by the Kentucky State Federation of Labor and the International Association of Machinists which last year conducted eight "basic" and four "advanced" week-long summer schools. In the curriculum of the latter institutes were daily two-hour courses on psychology, current economic developments, new problems in labor, and sessions on international affairs, African labor, and civil rights. These are labelled "horizon" courses by the union's educationists. The highest development of this approach of built-in progression in the summer school program, on a year-to-year basis, has taken place in the Steelworkers union education program. The fourth year program is described in another article in this publication.†

However, bearing in mind that without exception, programs going on outside the university do not meet all the criteria of "liberal" education and are, in the main, concentrated week-long experiences with some attempts to build progression into a one-week-per-year approach, there are other programs with "liberalizing" aims and direction which can be noted in this kind of survey.

---

*See page 5.

†See page 43.

Union Programs

Let us look at some of these programs in the unions themselves.

The most unique program in union education today is also the most uniquely financed. To my knowledge, it is the first and only program financed at least indirectly through collective bargaining. For this reason it reaches a large number of the union's members. The week-long residential program on "Critical Thinking in Human Relations" of New York City's Local 3, IBEW, has been made available to some 6,000 master electrician members of the local. The program has achieved much publicity so no more than its outline is required here.

Initiated in mid-1957, the program brings 30 members at a time to Bayberry, an old estate on Long Island owned by the Joint Industry Board of the Electrical Industry of New York City and the labor-management board which administers the industry's negotiated health and welfare fund. The objectives are to provide the participants with "the opportunity to examine some of the basic attitudes, knowledge and skills necessary for the independent and successful handling of . . . complex personal, family, work and social lives." The program uses lectures, demonstrations, reading and small group discussions to survey the rudiments of psychology, logic, communication, and problem solving as applied to daily living; and discussion of labor history, labor management problems, problems of the electrical industry and the future problems of the country. The emphasis throughout is on the questioning and analytical approach to thinking. The students work from Kenneth Keyes' text "How To Develop Your Thinking Ability" and samplings from Peter Drucker, Richard Hofstader and Frederick Lewis Allen on public affairs.

The cost of the program is paid for out of the jointly administered health and welfare fund. In addition, each member receives close to his week's lost wages from the fund. Just about all of the 6,000 master electrician members in the 30,000 member local have gone through the program in the last five years. A shorter version of this course is offered to members in other classifications of Local 3 at Cooper Union in New York City on a one-night-a-week basis.

The instructor at Bayberry, a young Columbia University graduate who had been teaching effective thinking to business executives, indicated early in the program that some 25% of those who attended the week-long course followed up by enrolling in some kind of adult education course.

This local hasn't stopped there. In 1959, the local's 40-odd business agents and officers started a course one morning each week on international affairs with a professor from Vassar College as the instructor. The course was not designed to cover current events, but rather to bring about a basic understanding of such issues as imperialism, colonialism, population trends, tariffs and ideological conflicts. Textbooks by Raymond Aaron and Joseph Schumpeter were assigned and examinations and term papers were part of the course. An implied, if not expressed criteria of liberal adult education—that of voluntary participation—has possibly been violated here. The course was mandatory for the participants!

More recently, the local conducted a program to educate a selected group of members for better citizenship and understanding of the workings of federal, state and city government. The program was held at Columbia University one night a week with the local's education adviser, Columbia Dean-Emeritus Harry J. Carman. The participants have since, in their turn, conducted similar courses for other members of the local, during four evenings a week at a Manhattan high school. The local's program also includes 43 four-year scholarships for members' sons and daughters, and two or three month trips abroad for full-time officials to study what is going on in other countries. (The prime mover and initiator of these programs is the local's business manager and the head of the New York City AFL-CIO Central Labor Council, Harry A. Van Arsdale, Jr. He has participated in some of the courses himself. It is conceivable that at least some groups in management and government and also in the labor movement were questioning the effectiveness of liberal adult education earlier this year when Mr. Van Arsdale negotiated the 25 hour week after a brief strike!)

A second week's program at Bayberry is under consideration.

The local is also planning a cultural program which will probably be financed again via the processes of collective bargaining. An attempt will perhaps be made to awaken interest in such places as the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts on whose board Van Arsdale serves. As the union's education director put it: "After all, our people build those buildings but never go back to them."

It is possible this local's program may set a pattern for other unions both in direction and in the method of financing. Such a development is probably more likely among the older unions than among the newer ones, if it occurs at all.

For many years now the UAW Education Department has been conducting an extensive week-long summer school program. Some 20 to 30 schools reach approximately 2500 local union officers and activists annually. Relying almost exclusively on the union's own full-time education and servicing staff as teachers, in recent years, the week has been built around a "core" program, which last year, for example, attempted to relate the union's collective bargaining goals to the general economic problems of the country. In addition, international affairs is heavily emphasized and related to the union's goals and problems. In all, the union through these schools, aims at giving the participants "a broader perspective of the world in which they live, and greater incentive to work toward a better world in their everyday activities on the job, and in their communities." All the reading and visual materials prepared for the students, as well as the instructors' outlines, are designed to promote broad-based discussion among the participants.

The preliminary results of an evaluation of two of the summer schools (conducted by an educational psychologist through the labor program of the University of Michigan-Wayne State University) indicates this educational experience results in significant shifts in attitudes in such areas as international understanding.

A new dimension to the UAW's program which already includes a program of foreign tours for members, was a Workshop on World Affairs held at the U.N. in November, 1961. Covering a four-day period, it included a close look at and discussion of the U.N. and its specialized agencies, discussion of the ICFTU, foreign trade and aid, and the "Peace Race."

The Steelworkers program is described elsewhere in this publication. Space considerations preclude considering any other programs. Mention should be made of the International Ladies Garment Workers' cultural program in New York and other areas. The Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO conducts many staff training and other conferences; many state central labor bodies conduct summer school and winter conference programs; such unions as the IUE, Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen, and other international unions conduct varied programs which have liberalizing elements in varying degrees.

Programs Outside the Unions

Programs by agencies outside the unions are few. The oldest such agency is, of course, the American Labor Education Service dating back some 35 years.

Formerly working in the social sciences and humanities subject matter areas, for the last decade it has concentrated on programs to "broaden the worker's understanding of our society in order to equip him more adequately for his role as a citizen today."

The ALES has seen itself primarily as an experimental and demonstration agency. One phase of ALES' work aims at developing an "internationally-minded labor citizenry." The core of this work is the annual week-long resident school on World Affairs and the U.N. in New York City. Held in each of the last eight years, usually at the height of the U.N. Assembly session in October or November, the schools have attracted 260 education directors, staff members, local union officers, and committee chairmen. The schools are designed to provide not only an intensive exposure to the U.N., its structure and functioning, but also presentations and discussions of the ICFTU, the ILO, international issues and major foreign policy problems. Experts from the U.N. Secretariat and delegations, university faculties, and others are used as teachers, speakers and resource people.

Out of this program have developed conferences on world affairs in other sections of the country, local union international affairs committees, contacts for foreign trade union visitors, group study tours of the U.N. (this year ALES arranged a number of such tours for the Canadian labor movement bringing the total number of tours to about 100 in the last decade) and other activities.

Though now only involved on a consultative basis, the ALES from 1958 to 1960 carried on an experimental-demonstration project in the Louisville, Kentucky, area, designed to develop a greater integration of unions with the community through study-action programs. The work included the development of many different kinds of education programs on community and other problems, which led to joint programs with community groups. Union leaders assumed at least 17 important posts on the boards of community agencies and on committees, and the program created a vital awareness, on the part of the Louisville labor movement, of the role it must play in the community.

Other aspects of the ALES' program must be passed over here, such as the annual White Collar Workshop, and conferences on specialized subjects.*

Noteworthy for the fact that it was conducting Labor Education Programs when very few other agencies inside and outside the Trade Union Movement were doing so is the Philadelphia Labor Education Association which emanated from the Philadelphia Board of Education. It was spearheaded by a few dedicated people in the Philadelphia area. Since 1940 (and sporadically in the 15 year period before that) the LEA has been conducting several one-to-three day conferences each year in cooperation with the Philadelphia Labor Movement. It has more recently also co-sponsored programs with the Union Leadership Academy in the Philadelphia area.

In a survey such as this, mention should be made of the program of the American Foundation for Continuing Education. Its program is built around selected readings, issued in paper-back books, culled from the fields of politics, foreign policy and economics as well as specially developed case studies covering such public policy areas as urban renewal, civil liberties, etc. The Foundation aims at enlarging the individual's "capacity to make sound judgments about important matters of public policy; to improve abilities to reason about, reflect upon, listen to, and express views on important ideas." Though its program is addressed to all adult groups, it has conducted a number of seminars for the second, third, and fourth year groups at Steelworkers' Schools and its materials have been used in other union programs. It is now attempting to expand its program with trade union groups and to further develop materials towards this end.

An attempt is also being made to introduce union members to the resources of their public libraries. This is being done through the program of the Joint Committee on Library Service to Labor Groups of the American Library Association. The Committee, made up of librarians and labor educators, now numbers eighteen members as compared to six members some 16 years ago when the Committee was started to ". . . discover ways of encouraging and assisting public libraries to develop specialized library services which will be useful to labor groups." Many others cooperate with this diligent and dedicated group of 18. A few examples of their activities include publication of reading lists for labor groups; introducing local union groups to library facilities; supplying films for union groups; and setting up "Labor and Literature" book discussion groups for trade unionists.

---

*Unfortunately, ALES was recently forced to disband. The very important function it has so ably performed in this field will now have to be taken over by other organizations and institutions.

Some 7500 to 10,000 union leaders yearly are reached by week-long educational experiences at summer schools. Countless more are reached through shorter conferences and institutes and one-night-a-week classes. Taking the summer schools alone some general observations may be pertinent to this survey:

—More of them are being held at universities;

—Broader subject matter than just "bread and butter" is more and more being introduced into the curriculum. (Whereas ten or fifteen years ago the university program planner had to suggest a course or session on economics or foreign affairs, today he is asked to put it in);

—There is greater consciousness of the need to make the "bread and butter" course a broader educational experience by liberalizing both the methodology and content.

Basically, unions have not seen it as their function to provide liberal education for their members and leaders. Through the efforts of union education directors and representatives dedicated to education, and insightful elected leaders, some unions in varying degrees have seen their function as providing "liberalizing" education. To quote the 1960 Executive Board Report of the Communications Workers of America reporting on the week-long staff institutes held at the University of Chicago on the theme, Human Relations in a Changing Society: "Two-fifths of the program dealt directly with practical union problems and three-fifths was conducted by University staff on subjects affecting our changing society."

Those setting policy for union education are always faced with the decision as to whether the union's education resources should be put into short-term education of a large number of members, long-term intensive education of a few members, or some combination of both these approaches. Until now, with some few exceptions, union policy in this country has elected the first-of these alternatives.

Some Indications of the Future

But the force of events is pushing unions to change this policy. A few of the major unions have been talking about extended programs for at least their staff people. In addition, at this writing, the AFL-CIO seems to be moving toward a staff training college which could involve programs of longer duration than a week.

But what has happened in the Communication Workers of America may be even more immediately significant. This union has had a highly developed education program directed at many levels of the union. It has trained its own education representatives, who conduct their own two-day institutes and a variety of staff training programs. Last year, for example, over 4,000 members and leaders of the union attended either CWA summer schools or two-day institutes.

The union's staff training has now taken a completely new direction, however. CWA has recently set up a program with the University of Chicago to train prospective and new staff members on a "co-op" basis, in which the trainees spend two months at the University and two months in the field. This experience is followed by another month back at the university and another month's training in the field. While at Chicago, trainees will study anthropology, sociology, psychology, economics, labor law and history, literature, and reading and writing skills. The field work will include working with experienced staff people on organizing, bargaining, etc., as well as observing the union's headquarters, Congress and government agencies in operation.

The reasoning behind such a program is revealing. It is eloquently expressed in the words of Joseph Beirne, CWA president, in addressing the dinner meeting at the opening of this program: "The challenges and problems faced by the American labor movement are entirely different from anything we have faced before and demand an educated person. The American labor union of 20 years, even 10 years, ago is not suited for today. It's outdated. . . . All aspects of unionism are becoming increasingly complex. In fact, the union member of today . . . is entirely different.

". . . We have grave responsibilities outside the collective bargaining relationship. . . . Eventually you will find yourself on school boards and in community organizations and asked what should be done about agriculture, educational problems, taxation, housing, race relations, recreation, water resources. . . . It is one thing to have opinions on these matters, but it is quite another to have the right questions and solutions. . . . As union staff people you are generalists as well as specialists. . . . And it is the liberal studies which you will be exposed to here which is the only kind of education that equips a person for the kind of role you will assume."[2]

Perhaps this new CWA approach indicates the direction at least some union education programs will take and further indicates that the most significant development in liberal education of unionists outside the university is an increasing demand by unions for liberal education for union leaders from the university.

---

[2] Excerpts from speech by Joseph Beirne reprinted in Adult Leadership, January, 1962.

Max Swerdlow

The position of the Canadian Labour Congress, says Swerdlow, is that technical training and liberal education are not mutually exclusive, but are in fact closely interdependent. As equal parts of labor education, they are given equal emphasis by the Educational Department of the Congress, which is responsible for all educational activity for union members. Swerdlow explains the role of Canadian universities in labor education liberal courses, and describes an important new plan involving the universities—to establish a labor college for union members who, although intellectually competent, would not meet the usual formal university entrance requirements.

Max Swerdlow is Director of Education of the Canadian Labour Council. He was Director of Organization for the former Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and has served as Chairman of the National Executive of the Canadian Conference on Education, and as a member of the Vocational Training Council.

LIBERAL EDUCATION IN CANADIAN LABOUR EDUCATION

Liberal education means many things to people. In the context of this discussion, liberal education will mean the subjects and courses embodied in the Canadian Labour Congress' labour education program which are not specifically "tool" or "skill" subjects. It is the theoretical or academic part of the program.

The position taken by the Canadian Labour Congress is that "skill" and "liberal" subjects are not mutually exclusive—they are, in fact, interdependent. They are equal parts of labour education.

To a great extent, a labour education program reflects a union's attitude towards and conception of the labour movement, society, and life itself. If a union regards itself only as a force primarily designed to defend the worker against abuse, to strive continually for improvements in economic conditions, and to counter-balance the power of management, then the educational program of that union will be designed to train informed and competent technicians and administrators. If, however, in addition, a union accepts also the proposition that the union is a social force, dedicated to the attainment of a better society, and a richer and fuller life for the individual, then the labour education program will strive not only to perfect skills, but also to develop a capacity for critical thinking and deep understanding.

It is true that campaigns and struggles of an immediate nature have to be undertaken, and labour education ought therefore to reflect the immediate objectives of the labour movement. But labour also has long-range goals and aspirations, and these too, must surely be projected in labour education. Sometimes, it is necessary to lay stress on one aspect in preference to others, in accordance with circumstances and immediate situations. But over the long run, labour education should reflect the sum total of labour's needs—its immediate objectives and its long-range aspirations. A little Spinoza must be added to the diet of spinach.

The Canadian Labour Congress has established the following guideposts for its educational program:

> "The aim of education in the trade union movement is: first, to stimulate and create a fundamental understanding of our society. It considers and analyzes the dynamics of our industrial democracy generally, and the labour movement in particular. It stresses the philosophy and the social, economic, and political objectives of organized labour. Second, it is designed to instruct and train members in methods that will enable them to discharge their union responsibilities more effectively and help them play a more important role in the labour movement. This training is the practical implementation of the immediate objectives and aspirations of the labour movement.
>
> "Labour education is and must be purposeful. It is not and can not be abstract and dogmatic. It must be constructive, responsible, and effective if unions are to attain a greater degree of social justice and economic security.
>
> "Labour education must also stress the importance of the labour movement as an integral part of our democratic society, and therefore, its acquired knowledge, its ever-increasing strength and growing influence must be geared to methods that are in the best interests of the community as a whole and must be compatible with our democratic way of life.
>
> "Motivated by these guiding principles, the Canadian Labour Congress promotes a broad and continuing program of education."

If one should ask which comes first or which is more important, "skill" or "liberal" education, the answer must be that neither is first; one is as important as the other.

Thus the choice of priorities is a difficult one, depending on many things. One particular determiner is the participating student. For a group of stewards interested in learning how to handle shop problems, specific tool subjects such as, "Grievance Procedure" or "Know Your Contract" will be the first choice. But for union members without specific union responsibilities, and therefore with no immediate need for a "tool" course, it may well be that a first choice would be something in the area of liberal education; such subjects as, "History of the Labour Movement," or "Understanding Our Economy," or "International Affairs," etc. Top-ranking union officers attending educational seminars very seldom request "tool" courses. Their major interests are in much broader fields—economic, political, and international. Thus, priorities are often determined by the kind of "students," and their level of union responsibility.

It is sometimes argued that the primary, and even perhaps the sole, responsibility of union education should be to train members to be more efficient and effective in the discharge of their union functions. Liberal education is considered "not bad, but let's do what we have to do first." I strongly disagree with this concept of what "we have to do first."

It is true, however, that labour education must, at all times, be purposeful. The knowledge and skills which a person acquires through education are his tools, as much as the plough is a tool to the farmer, a hammer to the carpenter, and a scalpel to the surgeon. If the carpenter or farmer is to do his job well, these tools must be used with care and wisdom. They must be in strong and steady hands. Liberal education in the labour movement is designed to provide knowledge and information about the ways of mankind, knowledge about the complex social problems and the environment in which the labour movement functions. This knowledge, it is hoped, will enable the trade unionist to think more clearly and profoundly, and thus establish for himself social values and principles. Unless such ends are also achieved, skill and efficiency will be meaningless.

The programs at most summer or winter schools conducted by the CLC Education Department consist in the main of tool subjects. However, at least one out of five courses generally given each week is a liberal education course. At this year's summer school in Ontario, for instance, eighteen students enrolled in a class on Social Psychology and Human Relations given by Professor John Morgan of the University of Toronto. The reaction of the students to this course was excellent.

The Education Department of the CLC has listed about 40 course descriptions. Only about half of these are treated as tool subjects; the rest are theoretical or liberal in approach. For example, there are two courses offered in the general area of collective bargaining. One of these, "Collective Bargaining," is generally regarded and normally treated as a tool course. It is a very important course, perhaps one of the best attended in the whole program. The content is dealt with at progressive levels, beginning with "Preparation for Collective Bargaining," and going on to such subjects as "Methods and Skills in Collective Bargaining," "Trends in Collective Bargaining," "Analyzing and Drafting Collective Agreements," and, even, "The Law and Collective Bargaining"—all designed to improve the skill and efficiency of bargaining committees and union officers. Another course, however, entitled the "Role of the Bargaining Process in a Democratic Society" has a very different purpose. Its end is liberal education. It deals with an analysis of the components of a democracy—labour, management, government, education, mass media, etc.—and it lays particular stress on the role and importance of the bargaining process.

The same principle is applied to other areas. Take, for example, the whole subject of economics. In the education work on this subject, trade unions have two main objectives. One is to equip members with the techniques and areas of knowledge required to conduct negotiations over what are commonly called "bread and butter" issues: wages, pension plans, insurance, and all other matters which are directly related to the economic and social welfare of the worker and his family. To achieve this end, tool courses are offered. There is, however, another, and no less important, objective. This is to give trade unionists a knowledge of economic matters which does not necessarily bear directly on their union bargaining activities; but which assists them to obtain insight into the workings of the economy, and equips them, as members of society, to deal more effectively with economic problems as they arise. In such a course, study is concerned with the structure of the national economy, how it works; the theoretical study of the relationship between wages, productivity, and prices; the problems of unemployment and inflation; and the relationship of the Canadian economy to the world economy.

Similar approaches are applied to political education. The following incident indicates how circumstances and needs direct our choice of the proper approach. The Canadian Labour Congress at its 1958 Convention formulated a political policy; it decided to participate with other groups in the formation of a new political party in Canada. From the time of this decision, to the point of actual formation of the New Democratic Party in August, 1961, the CLC's political education program was, in the main, liberal education. Among courses given were these: The Role of Political Parties in a Democracy; Understanding Government Structure; The Labour Movement in Politics; and Federal and Provincial Government Relations. No particular emphasis was placed on doing something or organizing something. Emphasis was strictly on understanding.

After the new party was founded, however, the kind of political education needed changed. The task became, and it has so remained, to provide tool courses in the organization of the New Democratic Party. In consequence, the Department is giving courses in such subjects as: How To Organize a New Party Club in Your Industry; Relationship between Your Local Union and the New Democratic Party; How To Win Elections; the New Democratic Party and Public Relations.

Frequently, even in tool courses, part of the time is given over to a liberal subject. For instance, a class of shop stewards studying Grievance Procedure will very often (for half a day of a one-week course) work with a different instructor, to examine Industrial Psychology, or more particularly, Human Relations.

Other subjects in the field of liberal education in the CLC program which receive a great deal of attention are: 1) International Affairs. In this course the instructors deal with such matters as world economic and political conditions, health and education conditions, population growth, international agencies, and disarmament. 2) Human Relations. There are several courses in this field dealing with such matters as discrimination, the U. N. Charter on Human Rights, Fair Employment Practices Acts, and the Canadian Bill of Rights. 3) Co-operative Education. In the past two years a good beginning was made in developing courses on the Co-operative Movement. These are, so far, general courses dealing with the history of the Co-operative Movement in Canada, the role of Co-operatives in a mixed economy, and the structure and activities of the Co-operative Movement in Canada. It is planned soon to develop tool courses also in this area—e.g., How To Establish a Credit Union, How To Organize a Consumer's Co-operative, Patronizing Co-operative Products and Services.

A recent five-day staff seminar in Ontario, attended by about 85 top-ranking officials, discussed "Labour's Public Responsibility." The seminar was designed to examine critically the sum total of labour's activities as they affect the union members and the general public. The examination was based on labour's public responsibility in collective bargaining; labour's public responsibility in national and international affairs; labour's public responsibility in politics. The students were not looking for improved methods or skills, but were, rather, vitally interested in examining labour's role in these fields in relation to the total social scene. Instructors were recruited from the labour movement, the universities, and the mass media. It was a most useful seminar—a good effort in liberal education.

In addition to union-sponsored programs, a number of Canadian universities also provide liberal [illegible] sult of a University-Labour Conference held in 1956, a National University Labour Education Committee was established, as well as a number of local committees. These committees organize and conduct seminars on a variety of subjects, planning their programs so as not to conflict with or duplicate the union-sponsored education program.

For instance, a course on automation, in a union-sponsored program often (but not always) tends to be a tool course. Students are taught how to cope with the introduction of automated equipment, with the position of the union in collective bargaining, with severance pay, clauses of intent, promotion, etc. On the other hand, at a recent seminar on automation sponsored by the University-Labour Education Committee of the University of British Columbia emphasis was, not on skills, but rather on the social impact of automation. The three-day seminar discussed automation under three topics: a century of industrial revolution; twentieth century automation; and possible impact of automation on labour unions. The instructional staff was in the main composed of sociologists and economists as well as trade unionists.

Dalhousie University-Labour Education Committee in their one-week seminar held this year discussed the following subjects: new developments in public policy in the Atlantic Provinces, unemployment, labour and productivity, labour's interest in international affairs, communication within the labour movement, and the labour movement in Sweden. The emphasis of the course was on analyzing the causes that give rise to such problems, and the effects that follow.

Other universities (e.g., the University of Alberta, University of Saskatchewan, University of Manitoba, University of Toronto, McMaster, Laval University and St. Francis Xavier University) are co-operating with the labour movement in similar programs.

An important step in the development of liberal education within the Canadian labour movement will have been taken if plans presently under discussion with McGill University, the University of Montreal and the Confederation of National Trade Unions (Catholic Syndicates) for a labour college in Canada materialize. The purpose of the labour college is stated in a recent memorandum:

> "The need for a labour college arises out of the expanded role and responsibilities of trade unions in Canada. Leaders, who are deeply aware of the problems and opportunities of the trade union movement, are a continuing requirement, and the training which will ensure such leadership must go beyond acquiring particular skills in negotiation and organization. A labour college, providing basic studies in the humanities and the social sciences as well as specialized instruction in the theory and practice of trade unionism, would do much to meet this need, especially if it were founded and operated with the full co-operation of the universities. It would open the way to higher studies for men and women who, although intellectually competent, would not meet formal university entrance standards. For those who show particular academic ability, it could provide a bridge to a full university degree program. Location of the college in Montreal, and the collaboration of both a French-speaking and an English-speaking university, would make possible a completely bilingual, bi-cultural institution. This aspect of the college in itself would serve an important purpose in Canadian society."

The memorandum also sets out the content of the college program: five main courses in economics, political science, history, sociology, and trade unionism—theory and practice. While specific course content has not yet been finally set, it is generally accepted that the courses will cover the following subjects:

Economics—Four sections: first, the basic ingredients of the economy—resources and wants; second, the organization of the economy and the basic allocation process by which resources are directed to the satisfaction of various human wants; third, the determination of a nation's income and the associated problems of unemployment, inflation and income redistribution; and, finally, international economics.

Political Science—An introduction to the theory and practice of modern political ideas and institutions, with particular attention to the Canadian federal system, its judicial alteration, and the Canadian problems of Constitutional Amendment, disallowance, and reservation. The political, economic, and administrative relations between central and provincial governments will be studied, as will the role of political parties in province and nation, and the relationship between federalism, political parties, and democracy.

History—Three sections: first, the economic development of Canada since 1867; second, the development of Canadian autonomy and Canadian-American relations since 1867; and, finally, political development and social changes since Confederation.

Sociology—A comparative study of social institutions and social structure aimed at analyzing basic forms of social relations, social groups, social control, and conditions of social change, with emphasis upon complex societies.

Trade Unionism—Theory and Practice—An examination of the nature and role of the trade union as it affects workers, management, and society as a whole. Stress will be on the philosophy and the social, economic, and political objectives of the organized labour movement in Canada. The course is divided into a number of parts, and will include the history and development of trade unions in Canada and other countries; the structure and government of the trade union and the trade union centre; labour-management relations, including various aspects of collective bargaining; legislation pertaining to the labour movement, the role of government in labour-management relations; and the role of labour in the political life of Canada.

The Department of Education in all its work is consciously trying to develop a broad program of liberal education. In fact, it is hoped that in the foreseeable future this phase of labour education will be the CLC's main responsibility, and that training and tool and skill courses will be the responsibility of the affiliated unions. For the time being, however, the Congress does have to take responsibility for trade union training. Only about a dozen unions in Canada have Education Departments, and although these unions have developed excellent programs, containing a definite amount of liberal education, the emphasis is on training and tool courses. Liberal education in the Canadian labour movement, however, constitutes a major effort. It will continue to grow both in scope and importance.

REVIEW

A. A. Liveright

Liveright reports forthright agreement among the writers that their experience supports the idea that university liberal education for labor is both necessary and feasible. He focuses his summary on defining the common problems revealed in the papers, and suggests the approaches for solving them that seem indicated in the experiences reported. A tentative look at future possibilities concludes his frank review.

A. A. Liveright is Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. Previously he has been Director of the Union Officers Program, the precursor of the present University of Chicago Union Leadership Program, and Executive-Secretary of the Inter-University Labor Education Committee, the predecessor of NILE.

A SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS AND DIRECTIONS

Modifying somewhat the task assigned by the editors—to review in this section the main points made with reference to the issues all contributors were asked to consider*—this summary focuses on three central aspects of liberal education for labor. Two of these—principles and conditions of cooperation between union and university, and required forms of adaptation of usual liberal programs to a union audience—are the questions raised by the editor. In place of the third, however, "the underlying concept of the role of liberal study in labor education," which has already been explored in the introduction, we have selected another problem category, one that emerged, during review of the papers, as of signal importance: the need that still exists to win support for the very idea itself, to encourage full commitment in unions and universities to the development of liberal education programs for union personnel. With relation to these questions, basing ourselves on the papers in this document, we present first the scope and nature of the problem, and then some directions for moving toward solutions.

---

*See Introduction, pages 1-4.

Common Problems

1. Winning support

Although they differ on specifics, the authors of the papers in this publication, all agree that labor union members—and especially union officers—need and profit from liberal education. Not one of them suggests that such education is either superfluous, or subsidiary to some other, more necessary, form of education. On the contrary, they assert, on the basis of their experience, a firm belief in the value of some kind of broader education for union men than is now generally available, describing what they have in mind variously as education which is general, non-vocational, less directly practical, less concerned with immediate organizational and union problems, more liberal in approach. In broad terms, they even agree that this "liberal" education should be concerned, at least in part, with individual goals, as well as with organizational ones, that it should expand the student's vision of his community, of the world, and of himself.

Following such assertions of personal conviction, however, the authors move hastily—sometimes fretfully—into an enumeration of the road blocks in the path of such educational endeavor. Although they espouse the cause themselves, they report that they must still do a major selling job to convince the leaders of unions, on the one hand, and the universities, on the other, that such education is sufficiently important to warrant the necessary investment of time, manpower, and money. They all also point out the constant need to convince, or sell, even the potential student. Thus they talk about the scepticism and indifference on the part of the university, the suspicion and resistance on the part of the union leaders, and the fears on the part of students. In the light of such inadequate commitment, the hard, practical question of financial support becomes a serious concern. Most of the experimental programs described in this manuscript were, in large part, financed by grants from foundations and other outside agencies. When these grants are spent, will universities have enough confidence and interest in these programs, and others like them, to help subsidize them? Will unions be willing to pay their share of the cost? Are universities and unions sufficiently convinced of the importance of such programs to contribute financially, and in other ways, to their continuation?

2. Providing for university-union cooperation

Both union educator and university professor indicate concern about the problems that arise when they attempt to work together, as they must, in the area of labor education. Interpreting from statements in the collected papers, we note several general factors underlying the problem of union-university cooperation as it develops at the operational level.

1. Trade unionism, as it has grown in the United States, is primarily a practical, pragmatic, business-type unionism. The tendency, therefore, is to place educational emphasis primarily on practical, vocational goals, rather than on theoretical or liberal education. (Such an emphasis, by the way, is not unique to unions, but is rather a reflection of values in our entire society.)
2. Consistent with such an approach, unions tend to stress education directed toward increasing understanding of the union as an institution, and developing loyalty to it—rather than to focus attention on areas primarily concerned with individual values, goals, and needs.
3. Further, the educational programs sponsored by unions tend, by and large, to emphasize practical, immediate, union problems rather than broad theories and concepts; universities are therefore urged to provide practical and parochial training, which they feel is not their business, rather than broad programs of liberal education, for which they feel more properly equipped.
4. Thus we come to the essential questions that must be asked when forms of cooperation between union and university are sought. Who is to establish goals of the programs, and decide on their content? Should the universities let the union take the lead, or should the unions abdicate their practical interests and permit the universities to woo them into the "ivory tower?" How can the universities make their unique contribution, and at the same time meet the educational needs of the unions?

3. Adapting programs to a union audience

Many persons in universities tend to dismiss cavalierly the notion of the need for especially designed programs and special methods of recruiting when unions are the object of liberal education programs. They point out that union members are free to enter the university's many courses and programs already scheduled, and open to all in the population. Why, they want to know, should the university have to develop special programs for unions? To those who have worked in this area, however, the fact is clear that only with programs especially designed and directed to them, will union members be brought into the exciting study of liberal subjects. This point is emphasized in almost all of the papers, but especially in those of McCollum and Gould.

Investigations into the so-called "natural audience" for liberal education (i.e., those who register on their own volition for adult liberal education programs), indicate that this audience consists primarily of college graduates, middle aged, in the upper middle income group, with leisure, and with the habit of attending educational programs. To rely merely on this "natural" audience is to forego the possibility of involving any sizeable number of union men.

Special recruiting and special programming—both aimed specifically at union members—must be, at least for the time being, essential features of any serious effort on behalf of the union audience. Such an approach is already accepted practice with respect to programs for nurses, doctors, businessmen, accountants, personnel men, secretaries, and many other groups in the society. Universities need, therefore, feel no conflict about offering special programs also to union members. They must do so, if they really believe that liberal education for all citizens is a requisite for a free and democratic society.

Another corollary problem, mentioned in several papers, is how to secure the kind of teaching from traditional university faculty members that is required for a group of mature and practical-minded union members. How can faculty be selected (or trained) who will know how to talk, but not talk down, to their audiences, and who will be able to achieve the kind of student involvement that learning requires? (A universal problem in liberal adult education, may we add, not at all unique in labor education.)

Common Directions and Approaches

Stemming almost directly from the problems they describe are the authors' suggestions for desirable directions and approaches in seeking solutions. A reading of the articles suggests the following areas of agreement concerning the approach toward solving the problems described above.

1. Labor education experts both in unions and universities have a continuing obligation and task to convince their institutions of the importance of labor education programs for union members. This suggests that better and more continuing methods for evaluating such programs are required to assist in this task of convincing union "brass" and university administrators of the value of such education.
2. Both unions and universities must face the problem of financing, head-on, and must either accept the need for special financing, or forget entirely the idea of liberal education for union members. On the one hand, universities must be willing to cover some of the costs, and to subsidize these programs at least to the extent that they support programs for other groups in our society. And, on the other hand, unions must realize that such education is expensive, and that they must bear their share of the burden of costs. Both unions and universities must also cooperate more effectively in supporting legislation aimed at providing funds for liberal adult education.
3. Much of the practical and fundamental union education can probably be conducted effectively by the unions themselves. On the other hand, when it comes to the broad, general, liberal education programs, universities have a very special and unique contribution to make in planning and offering such educational programs.
4. The present forms of union-university policy committees, set up for the purpose of planning and setting policy for university-connected labor education programs, must be continued and extended, so that differences, suspicions, and gaps in thinking between universities and unions may be overcome. In this way, the dilemmas of practicality versus theory, specialization versus

general education, may be settled in the process of practical planning of programs, rather than, as it has sometimes in the past, by conjecture.

5. Universities must take such steps as are required to improve the quality and nature of teaching in liberal education programs for union members, and they must realize that, although there should be no compromise in quality and standards, there are nevertheless needs for special methods and techniques in dealing with all such selected audiences.
6. Universities must also get over their reluctance to offer programs especially directed to union members, and they must realize that it is only in this way that they will involve these very important leaders in our society in necessary programs of liberal education.

Future Directions

The task of prophesying the future of liberal education for labor is difficult, and probably premature. Enough experiments are underway, however, to make some stock-taking possible.

There does seem to be enough interest on the part of unions and universities to suggest that liberal programs will continue to develop and expand, but it does not seem likely that the expansion will be either dramatic, widespread, or immediate. The experiments that have been launched suggest some directions that might be taken, and give some evidence of the potential interest in such programs, and of their impact on participants. Whether such evidence is used to expand liberal education programs widely will depend essentially on the dedication and practical wisdom of the labor educators themselves.

In this connection, we must regret the passing from the scene of the American Labor Education Service. For years, this pioneering agency emphasized the importance of a broader education for labor; it has been one of the most important forces working for a liberal education emphasis in labor programs. One must wonder now, where the pressure for liberal education for labor will come from in the years ahead. It can be hoped that NILE, and the various informal and formal associations of union and university persons in labor education will organize to fill the gap left by ALES. Recent interest in the establishment of labor colleges in the United States and Canada also suggests that a new development of broad, liberal, non-residential labor education may be coming.

The elements necessary for growth are here, but there appears to be no clear trend which suggests a massive increase in activities. It is now clearly up to the unions, the universities, and the foundations, who can help to provide the opportunities for further experimentation, to build upon these elements and to support the kind of growth in liberal education which all the authors in this publication agree is required and demanded.

ERIC Clearinghouse

APR 2 5 1969

on Adult Education